

Durham E-Theses

A contextual analysis of the landscape of Cambridgeshire in the early Anglo-Saxon period

Taylor, Barry

How to cite:

Taylor, Barry (2003) *A contextual analysis of the landscape of Cambridgeshire in the early Anglo-Saxon period*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/3155/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

A CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE LANDSCAPE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE
IN THE EARLY ANGLO-SAXON PERIOD

Barry Taylor

A copyright of this thesis rests
with the author. No quotation
from it should be published
without his prior written consent
and information derived from it
should be acknowledged.

Submitted for the degree of M.A.

Department of Archaeology, University of Durham

July 2003



25 AUG 2004

A CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE LANDSCAPE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE IN THE EARLY ANGLO-SAXON PERIOD

Barry Taylor

Abstract

This project seeks to characterise the landscape of Cambridgeshire during the Early Anglo-Saxon period. In particular it aims to re-assess existing models of land use and test the traditional views of continuity and change between the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. These aims will be accomplished through a contextual study of the archaeological information, the underlying methodology of which will consist of the following:

- Examining the ways in which different sites are recovered and assessing the extent of any biases within the data set.
- Identifying and categorising different forms of settlement by examining evidence for surviving features.
- Analysing the pattern of settlement through space and time by placing sites within their own cultural and historic landscapes. In particular, the extent of localised variation in land use, site abandonment and settlement shift will be assessed in order to appreciate the dynamics of the landscape and to examine critically the narratives of this period.

Research will concentrate on the modern county of Cambridgeshire, drawing upon all available data from both published and unpublished sources.

The archaeological data for this period forms a rich and varied resource, many aspects of which are now well understood. However, research is typically conducted within a framework of historical periods, each of which has its own agendas. This has left certain aspects of the archaeology relatively under studied and makes an examination of the relationships between periods problematic. The proposed project will adopt a more uniform approach to the data, examining both the nature of settlement sites and their cultural and historical context. This will allow a re-evaluation of historical narratives relating to the changes in the cultural landscape through time.

Submitted for the degree of M.A.

Department of Archaeology,
University of Durham

July 2003



But when this material is properly understood, and its limitations respected, there remain wide aspects of the period which can be strongly illuminated by its use.

J.N.L. Myres. 1937. P. 331

1	PROJECT BACKGROUND	8
1.1	Introduction.....	8
1.2	Research aims	9
1.3	Methodology	12
1.3.1	The extents of the project.....	12
1.3.2	Data collection and management	13
1.3.3	Dating and terminology.	15
1.3.4	Site definitions.	16
1.3.5	System of referencing	17
1.4	The Research Area.....	18
1.4.1	The physical landscape	18
1.4.2	History of fieldwork.....	19
2	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	23
2.1	Introduction.....	23
2.2	Sample bias, representativity and archaeological source criticism.....	24
2.3	Problems of dating in the Anglo-Saxon sample	28
2.4	Over and under-representation within the data set	31
2.4.1	Settlements.....	31
2.4.2	Cemeteries.....	36
2.5	The data set through time.....	38
2.5.1	The Nineteenth Century	39
2.5.2	1900-1949	40
2.5.3	1950-Present	40
2.6	Conclusion	44
3	INTERPRETING THE DATASET	62
3.1	Introduction.....	62
3.2	Method	62
3.3	Settlement sites: overview	63
3.3.1	Distributions and site densities	63
3.3.2	Building types and functional interpretations	66
3.3.3	Settlement morphology	70
3.4	Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement sites in Cambridgeshire.....	73
3.4.1	General distributions in the county	73
3.4.2	Spatial analysis.....	76
3.4.3	Analysis of sites with settlement characteristics.....	79
3.4.4	Conclusions.....	86
3.5	Funerary sites: overview	87
3.5.1	Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries	87
3.5.2	Cemetery morphology	88
3.6	Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites in Cambridgeshire	91
3.6.1	General distributions.....	91
3.6.2	Spatial analysis.....	92
3.6.3	Analysis of funerary sites.....	94
3.6.4	Conclusions.....	101
3.7	Interpreting metalwork finds.....	103

3.8	Early Anglo-Saxon metalwork finds in Cambridgeshire.....	105
3.8.1	General distributions in the county.....	105
3.8.2	Spatial analysis.....	106
3.8.3	Analysis of metalwork finds.....	107
3.8.4	Conclusions.....	113
3.9	Summary of results.....	115
4	RE-CONSTRUCTING THE LANDSCAPE.....	145
4.1	Saxon settlement in the Late Roman landscape.....	145
4.1.1	Explaining the change: current interpretations.....	150
4.1.2	Settlement mobility: An alternative explanation.....	151
4.2	Settlements and cemeteries: the living and the dead.....	153
4.3	Cemeteries in the landscape.....	160
4.3.1	The physical landscape.....	160
4.3.2	Cemeteries in the historic landscape: Reuse of monuments and sites....	162
4.4	Conclusions.....	167
5	DISCUSSION: THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE.....	184
5.1	The Roman to Saxon transition: continuity or change.....	184
5.2	Understanding the Anglo-Saxon Landscape.....	192
5.2.1	The Settlement landscape.....	192
5.2.2	Funerary ritual and the landscape.....	195
5.3	Conclusions.....	202
6	Appendix 1: Site Category Definitions.....	207
7	Appendix 2: Catalogue of Sites.....	208

Figure 1: The political and physical geography of the Cambridgeshire region.....	22
Figure 2: The numbers of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites by basic category	46
Figure 3: Numbers of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites by type.	46
Figure 4: Method of discovery of metalwork finds within the Anglo-Saxon sample.	46
Figure 5: Method of discovery of all Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites.	47
Figure 6: Method of discovery of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites by category of site.....	47
Figure 7: Numbers of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered each decade.	48
Figure 8: Recorded instances of metal objects on Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon settlement and funerary sites.....	48
Figure 9: Distribution of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites.	49
Figure 10: Numbers of sites of each category by period. All Anglo-Saxon sites have been included.....	50
Figure 11: Percentage of settlements of each period and the method of discovery.....	50
Figure 12: Numbers of sites discovered by field walking where pottery and other artefacts have been recorded.	51
Figure 13: Total number of sites discovered by field walking and the number recorded by the Fenland Project.	51
Figure 14: Total numbers of fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements discovered by field walking and the numbers recorded by the Fenland Project.	52
Figure 15: Distribution of all sites discovered through fieldwalking	52
Figure 16: Percentage of settlements of each period discovered through excavation since the nineteenth century.	53
Figure 17: Percentage of cemeteries of each period and the method of discovery.....	53
Figure 18: Date of discovery of all fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites.....	54
Figure 19: Date of discovery of fourth century sites by category.....	54
Figure 20: Date of discovery of all Early Anglo-Saxon sites by category.	55
Figure 21: Date of discovery of fourth century sites by the method of discovery.....	55
Figure 22: Date of discovery of all Early Anglo-Saxon sites by the method of discovery.	56
Figure 23: Distribution of all fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered in the nineteenth century.	57
Figure 24: Distribution of all fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered between 1900 and 1949.	58
Figure 25: Distribution of all fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered between 1950 and 1998.	59
Figure 26: Method of discovery of fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites during the nineteenth century.....	60
Figure 27: Numbers of fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered in the Peterborough City district through time and the method of discovery.....	60
Figure 28: Plan showing archaeological activity in Cambridgeshire.	61
Figure 29: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon sites in East Anglia	118
Figure 30: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon sites in the Suffolk Sandlings	119

Figure 31: Plan of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at Mucking.....	120
Figure 32: Plan of the Early Anglo-Saxon features at Orsett	121
Figure 33: Plan of the Anglian settlement at West Heslerton.....	122
Figure 34: Length and breadth of excavated Early Anglo-Saxon post built structures. .	123
Figure 35: Reconstruction of Grubenhauser or Sunken Featured Buildings from West Stow	123
Figure 36: The phasing of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at Mucking	124
Figure 37: The phasing of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at West Stow	125
Figure 38: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements in Cambridgeshire.....	126
Figure 39: Distances between Early Anglo-Saxon settlements	127
Figure 40: Distances between Early Anglo-Saxon sites known from settlement features.	127
Figure 41: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features to sites with just Sunken Featured Buildings.	127
Figure 42: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features to sites to pottery scatters.	128
Figure 43: Distances between Early Saxon sites known from settlement features in the Nene valley.	128
Figure 44: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features in the Nene valley to the nearest site with just sunken featured buildings.....	128
Figure 45: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features in the Nene valley to the nearest pottery scatter.....	129
Figure 46: Distances between Early Saxon sites known from sunken featured buildings.	129
Figure 47: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from sunken featured buildings to pottery scatters.	129
Figure 48: Distances between Early Saxon sites known from pottery scatters.	130
Figure 49: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Mucking	131
Figure 50: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Beckford.....	132
Figure 51: Area of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in relation to the number of individuals interred.	132
Figure 52: The Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Berinsfield	133
Figure 53: The Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Springfield Lyons	134
Figure 54: Part of the Early Anglo-Saxon cremation cemetery at Spong Hill	135
Figure 55: The Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Buckland,.....	136
Figure 56: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites in Cambridgeshire.	137
Figure 57: Distances between group burials.....	138
Figure 58: Distances between group burials along the river Cam.	138
Figure 59: Distances between group burials along the river Nene.	138
Figure 60: Distances between group burials and single burials.....	139
Figure 61: Distances between single burials.....	139
Figure 62: Distances between single burials along the river Cam.	139
Figure 63: Distances between single burials along the river Nene.	140
Figure 64: Comparison of the types of artefacts recovered from Early Anglo-Saxon sites	140

Figure 65: Plan showing a foundation deposit beneath a post hole structure at West Heslerton	141
Figure 66: Distribution of metalwork finds in Cambridgeshire.....	142
Figure 67: Distances between metalwork finds.....	143
Figure 68: Distances between metalwork finds along the river Cam.....	143
Figure 69: Distances between metalwork finds along the river Nene.....	143
Figure 70: Distance between metalwork finds and group burials.....	144
Figure 71: Distance between metalwork finds and settlements.....	144
Figure 72: Distribution of Fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements in Cambridgeshire.....	169
Figure 73: Distances between Early Saxon settlements and settlements occupied in the fourth century.....	170
Figure 74: Roman settlement patterns along the Nene Valley	171
Figure 75: Date of establishment of sites occupied in the fourth century.....	172
Figure 76: Date of abandonment of sites occupied in the fourth century.....	172
Figure 77: Date of abandonment of fourth century sites by date of establishment.....	172
Figure 78: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Mucking	173
Figure 79: Location of the Anglian cemetery at West Heslerton	174
Figure 80: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon sites at Cassington.....	175
Figure 81: Early Anglo-Saxon sites at North Shoebury, Essex	176
Figure 82: Location of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and settlements in East Yorkshire	177
Figure 83: Distances from settlement sites to the nearest funerary site.....	178
Figure 84: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements and cemeteries in Cambridgeshire.....	179
Figure 85: Topographic context of funerary sites.....	180
Figure 86: Instances of re-use of earlier monuments by Early Anglo-Saxon burials.....	180
Figure 87: Dates of Early Anglo-Saxon burials re-using earlier monuments.....	180
Figure 88: The topographic context of Early Anglo-Saxon burials re-using earlier monuments and Roman cemeteries.....	181
Figure 89: Graph showing distances from Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and settlements occupied in the fourth century.....	181
Figure 90: Distribution of Fourth century settlements and Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in Cambridgeshire.....	182
Figure 91: Numbers of Early Anglo Saxon cemetery sites around the Roman town of Cambridge by area.....	183
Figure 92: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon burials around Cambridge.....	183
Figure 93: Map showing zones of settlement and cemetery in the north west of Cambridgeshire.....	204
Figure 94: Comparison of the floor plan of the post hole building at Foxton with examples from Early Anglo-Saxon Settlements.....	205

1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

Landscape projects offer the opportunity to examine many aspects of past cultural activity through the study of the relationships between sites of different types, their contemporary cultural context and their place in the historic landscape. Such an approach offers some exciting possibilities for the study of the Early Anglo-Saxon period, a period that is defined largely by its relationship with the preceding Roman centuries and the later emergence of Anglo-Saxon England. In treating the fifth and sixth centuries as a transition between two broader cultural units a considerable body of research has focused upon specific research issues such as the ending of Roman Britain and the ethnic character of the post-Roman population, interpreted largely on the basis of an established historical narrative. At its most traditional this framework provides a mechanism to explain the change in material culture between the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, typically in the terms of a movement of peoples from the continental mainland into late or post Roman Britain. Whilst the perceived nature of this movement varies, from massed migration or invasion (e.g. Collingwood & Myres 1937) to models of elite take over and the survival of large proportions of the native population (e.g. Higham 1992) the cause of change and the focus of investigation remains the same. Such an approach has left many aspects of the Early Anglo-Saxon period under-theorised (though with certain notable exceptions e.g. Pader 1982, Richards 1992, Lucy 1998) and has led to a lack of critical attention to the complexities of social behaviour.

By undertaking an investigation into the landscape of the Early Anglo-Saxon period it is possible to examine the validity of these established historical models. In particular this project has sought to examine a number of issues traditionally used to explain and describe the change from Roman to Anglo-Saxon such as the decline in settlement numbers in the fifth and sixth century and the apparent discontinuity in the settlement landscape. These are typically interpreted as evidence for a change in the rural economy and patterns of landuse (e.g. Higham 1992 p.113) due, at least in part, to the collapse of the Late Roman economy and the arrival of Germanic settlers. This project will take a broader view of the evidence for settlement and landscape, focusing on the context of each site in terms of physical location, relationship with other sites and their place within their own historical milieu. In this way it will shift from focusing upon the issues of continuity or change to a greater understanding of landscape dynamics.

1.2 Research aims

The main aim of this project is a characterisation of the cultural landscape of Cambridgeshire during the Early Anglo-Saxon period (defined for the purpose of this project as c.410-700AD). Characterisation, in the context of this project, has three aspects that can be summarised as follows. The first is an understanding of the nature of the archaeological data for the period in terms of its distribution, recovery and how representative it is of the situation in the past. Of particular interest is the high number of Late Roman settlements in comparison to the relatively low number of Early Anglo-Saxon sites. This project seeks to examine whether this is a reflection of changes in the patterns of settlement and landuse between the fourth and fifth centuries or whether it is

a product of the ways in which archaeological sites are discovered. The second is what that data means in terms of human activity in the past. For example, do all finds of settlement-related features represent the same types of site or is there any evidence for variation in the sorts of activities that took place within the landscape? In the same way, are all stray finds of metal objects indicative of funerary sites? The third aspect is how do different types of sites, and more importantly the social activities that they represent, relate to each other, and what is their relationship with the Late Roman landscape? What, for example, is the relationship between settlement patterns between the Late Roman and the Early Anglo-Saxon period and what is the evidence for either continuity or change in cultural practices?

Through this characterisation of the data the project seeks to understand the cultural landscape of the research area between AD400 and AD650. The term cultural landscape is used here to mean the meaningfully constituted and understood world of the people living during the period that we define as the Early Anglo-Saxon period. Following from Bourdieu's theory of practice (1977) and its application to archaeology (e.g. Barrett 1994) this world is regarded as being both the product of continuous social action (or practice) and the means by which such activities are structured. Whilst a construction of the entire social world of the Early Anglo-Saxon period is clearly beyond the scope of this project it remains possible to base interpretation within the broader context of social practice.

The project also aims to critically assess ideas of either a break or a transition between the Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon periods by grounding the understanding of the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries within the context of the preceding fourth century. The system of historical periodisation of which the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods are a part is the product of our world and, whilst a reflection of changes in the historical and archaeological data, exerts a tremendous influence over the ways in which we perceive the past. Nowhere is this more obvious than at the boundaries between two periods where, by their very definition, some form of change or transition must take place. However, the past was not a series of static moments punctuated by sudden change but was an ongoing process. As Halsall points out, given the dynamic nature of social change the idea of transition begins to 'sound hollow' (Halsall. 1995 p.39). Furthermore, debates surrounding such transitional moments frequently fail to contextualise their analysis into the broader chronological framework. For example, settlement shift is seen as characterising the change from Roman to Saxon across much of England and yet, as will be shown, is also a feature of the landscape throughout the Roman period. Similarly, whilst a major change in funerary practice between the Late Roman and the Early Anglo-Saxon periods is taken as evidence for cultural change, the move from cremation to inhumation as the dominant funerary practice during the Roman period is not. This project attempts to move away from debates surrounding the nature and extent of cultural continuity or change between these two periods by looking in detail at the fourth century landscape and how this relates to the patterns of settlement and landuse in the Early Anglo-Saxon period.

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 The extents of the project

The spatial extents of the project were defined by the boundaries of the modern county of Cambridgeshire, including the separate unitary authority of Peterborough. This area is a relatively recent creation, post dating the archaeological period under study and is not considered to bear any relation to political boundaries during the fourth to sixth centuries. Instead, the decision to use a modern county as the research area was based on the system of archiving and depositing information relating to archaeological sites by county. The county of Cambridgeshire was chosen for a variety of reasons. The well established antiquarian tradition, particularly around Cambridge itself and along the Nene Valley, the work of research bodies such as the Nene Valley Research Committee and the Fenland Project and the numerous sites discovered ahead of development have created a rich and varied resource. Furthermore, much of this data is easily accessible, either through publications such as the Fenland project reports or the computerised sites and monuments records held at Cambridge and Peterborough. Yet this has received little attention in comparison with neighbouring areas such as Suffolk (e.g. Scull 1992; Newman 1992) and Northamptonshire. The project also refers to the Roman towns of Sandy (Bedfordshire) and Great Chesterford (Essex), both of which lie on the border of the research area.

The temporal limits of the projects were originally established to examine both the Late Roman and Early Saxon landscapes by analysing all data from the fourth to the sixth centuries. However, the large number of fourth century settlements made such an undertaking impossible. The project was, therefore, re-designed to examine the fifth and sixth century landscape but with particular reference to the relationships with the

preceding, fourth century, sites. This allowed a detailed characterisation of the Early Anglo-Saxon material that could be understood within the context of the Late Roman landscape.

The extents of the data collection and the level of detail that the project would go to for each individual site had to be defined immediately as this would have an effect upon the data management strategies. It was decided that every recorded site or find dated to the between the fourth and mid seventh centuries (the later date taken as marking the end of the Early Anglo-Saxon period) should be collected and analysed in order to observe any variation in the distribution of different types of material or in the relationship between various types of site. Such a broad data collection strategy, leading to the creation of an extensive database, had an effect upon the level of detail that could be collected for each site. In each case the spatial and temporal location of the site, the date and means of discovery and the different forms of artefactual and structural data recovered were entered into the database. In specific cases further information, relating to the nature of the excavation or to the material culture, was gathered either from published or unpublished sources. Whilst such an approach barely scratches the surface of any particular site, it allows a broader understanding of larger areas than could be achieved if each site was studied in greater detail.

1.3.2 Data collection and management

The primary source of data was the county Sites and Records Office at Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough District Authority, with additional records relating to Great Chesterford obtained from Essex County Council. Further records were obtained

from the appendices of the relevant Fenland Project volumes and the annual summaries of archaeological works compiled by *Medieval Archaeology*, *Britannia*, the *Journal of Roman Studies* and the *Proceedings of the Cambridgeshire Antiquarian Society*.

Due to the expected size of the data-set a strategy for the management of the information was devised prior to the start of the data collection. The potential for large numbers of individual records and the extensive geographic area of the project necessitated the use of a computer database and associated GIS the choice of which was largely limited by availability. All records were entered into a MS Access database which was linked to G-sys, the GIS package developed by Dominic Powlesland for use on the Heselton Parish Project. Data from each site was entered into a separate field on the database and assigned a unique site code and was analysed within the database using specifically designed queries, the results of which were read by the GIS and displayed spatially. Analysis of the spatial relationships between sites was carried out using the measure function in G-sys, with the results entered into a separate database. For each entry the site code of the target site and the closest site was entered, allowing more detailed examination of specific cases once generalised patterns had been observed. Results of the spatial analysis were analysed in MS Excel and the resulting tables and graphs exported into the thesis. Examination of the topographic settings of the sites had to be conducted using paper copies of the Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale maps as these were the only source for detailed height information. At this scale the contours are marked at five metre intervals providing a good representation of the physical landscape. The map sheets were photocopied and the distribution of sites printed onto them at the same scale. The height

of each site and its location in relation to any topographic features (i.e. break of slope, top of hill, flat ground) was appended to the database entry for each site.

1.3.3 Dating and terminology.

The dates of sites assigned by the county SMRs and other sources of data have been used throughout this project. Where different sources provided conflicting dates for the same site the most recent was used.

All sites known to have been occupied during the fourth century were collected, regardless of the date at which they were established or went out of use. In addition a small number of sites dated as Late Roman by the SMR were included as coin finds indicated a fourth century date. For the purpose of this project these sites have been described as Fourth Century or Late Roman.

Any site described as Early Anglo-Saxon or dated to between 410AD and 700AD was also collected and described as Early Anglo-Saxon. In addition the SMR contained a number of sites that were dated to the Anglo-Saxon period whilst being described as 'possibly early'. These were also collected and included in the dataset following an analysis of the possible effect they might have on biasing the sample (see chapter 2). Where these poorly dated sites are referred to later in the text they are described as 'possibly Early Anglo-Saxon'. It should be noted, however, that the terms Roman and Anglo-Saxon, which are used throughout the project, should be considered as chronological markers and do not imply any ethnic or cultural affiliation.

For the purpose of the management of the dataset each site was given a unique numeric code. Throughout the text, when a site is referred to this code is given in brackets (e.g. site 409), and may be cross-referenced with the catalogue of sites that forms the appendix.

1.3.4 Site definitions.

Broadly speaking the dataset has been divided into three types of site; settlements, funerary sites and stray or un-provenanced metalwork finds. The initial characterisation of the dataset also includes a more detailed breakdown of the different types of site based upon the nature and type of archaeological material present. A full list of these categories and the criteria upon which they are based has been included in appendix 1.

From chapter 3 onwards the broad data groups have been divided into smaller categories or sub-groups. Settlements have been sub-divided into three groups. Firstly, settlement features; any site with one or more post-built structures with or without other archaeological features such as ditches, sunken featured buildings and pits. Secondly, sunken featured buildings; any site with one or more sunken featured buildings but no other contemporary features. Thirdly, surface scatters; any sites that are known only from artefact assemblages that have been recovered from the modern ground surface. Funerary sites have been divided into two sub-groups. These are single burials and group burials, the latter being any find of two or more graves. This was undertaken in order to conduct a critical examination of possible differences in the cultural activity that these sites may represent. For example, the high incidence of settlement sites where only sunken featured

buildings were found suggested that such areas may have served a different function from those where post-built structures were found.

This division of the dataset was undertaken through an examination of the types of features and material culture present at each site. In several cases it was necessary to consult several sources in order to distinguish between surface scatters of domestic pottery and fragments of cremation urns but in all such cases it has been possible to assign those sites into either the settlement or funerary categories. Sub-dividing these groups on the basis of the nature of the archaeological material present was problematic as many sites had been only partially excavated. These sub-groupings should, therefore, be considered as arbitrary divisions within the data, the validity of which is examined for each site on the basis of the following; the method used to recover the site, the extents of the excavation and the presence or absence of contemporary remains in the immediate area.

1.3.5 System of referencing

Where a site is mentioned in the text it is followed by a unique code, which can be cross referenced with the catalogue of sites in appendix 2. The entry for each site in the database includes a reference to the source material. References to textual sources have only been included where they have been consulted for additional information that was not contained in the database. Where statements have been made that are based upon unpublished material held in the county sites and monuments record they have been followed by a reference to the source of the archive (e.g. SMR Cambs). In all other cases

references have been made to the source of the information in accordance with university guidelines.

1.4 The Research Area

1.4.1 The physical landscape

The county of Cambridgeshire, (taken here to include the separate unitary authority of Peterborough), is located in the south east of England, directly to the south of Lincolnshire and to the west of Norfolk and Suffolk.

The physical geography and environment varies considerably across the county. The terrain in the south and west is characterised by an undulating landscape of low hills and river valleys. In the north and east of the county lie the Cambridgeshire fens, a flat, low lying environment, some areas of which are below sea level. The county is bisected by the river Ouse, which runs diagonally from the south west to the north east. The three other major rivers in the area are the Cam, Nene and Welland. The Cam runs from the south and joins the Ouse in roughly the middle of the county. The Nene and Welland are located in the north west, running roughly parallel with each other from west to east.

The majority of the county is under arable cultivation. The major urban centres are located at Peterborough in the north west and Cambridge in the south of the county. Smaller built up areas are scattered thinly across the south and west with a much smaller number located in the fens.

1.4.2 History of fieldwork

The county of Cambridgeshire and the now separate unitary authority of Peterborough have a strong tradition of archaeological research. Perhaps the greatest pioneer of the discipline was Edmund Artis who worked extensively along the Nene valley in the middle of the nineteenth century, recording Early Anglo-Saxon inhumations at Woodston (Meaney 1964) and excavating the monumental Roman Palatium at Durobrivae, (Castor). Unfortunately Artis died before this site was written up, though his illustrations were published and show the high level of recording that he undertook. The work of other antiquarians and collectors during the nineteenth and early twentieth century has resulted in an enormous quantity of archaeological information and in particular, Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites. For example, the extensive cemeteries at Edix Hill Hole (Wilkinson 1868) and Hoopers Field (Foster 1880), Barrington, St. Johns Collage Cricket Field, Cambridge (Fox 1923), and Linton Heath (Neville 1854) are among the many sites excavated at this time.

The high level of work continued into the last century with, first, Cyril Fox and then Tom Lethbridge excavating a number of Early Anglo-Saxon sites within the county. As well as excavating numerous sites Fox's greatest contribution was his synthesis of the wealth of knowledge from excavation and research that had been undertaken over the previous decades (Fox 1923). Tom Lethbridge was also a prolific fieldworker excavating, among other things, possibly the first evidence for Early Anglo-Saxon settlement activity in the county (Lethbridge 1927), only a few years after Leeds conducted his first excavations at Sutton Courtney (Leeds 1923). At roughly this time the first organised research into the archaeology of the Fenland region was undertaken under the newly established Fenland

Research Committee (Hall and Coles 1994 p.6). Though short lived (the committee only lasted from 1932-1940) this group pioneered systematic and scientific archaeology through the integration of palaeo-environmental studies with excavation (Hall and Coles 1994 p.6-7).

Work continued throughout the post-war years with numerous excavations such as the Roman villas at Rushey Farm (Great Staughton) and Arbury Road (Cambridge) (Scott 1993), and the Early Anglo-Saxon secondary inhumations cut into a prehistoric barrow at Cherry Hinton (Meaney 1964). Post-war development was also to have a major impact on archaeological work within the area. The planned development of Peterborough New Town first led to a comprehensive survey of the known archaeology of the area by Chris Taylor for the Royal Commission (Taylor 1969). Then, in the face of increasing development in this area, the Nene Valley Research Committee was established in 1972 (Wild 1973). Undertaking excavation ahead of development this group was responsible for the discovery and recording of a large number of sites including the Roman villa at Sacrewell (Challands 1974) and parts of the suburbs of the Roman Town of Durobrivae (e.g. Dannell 1974). Perhaps more importantly, however, were the excavations at Orton Hall Farm (e.g. Mackreth 1974, 1976), which have produced the clearest evidence for continuity of occupation between the Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon periods in the country. Elsewhere in the region systematic field surveys were being undertaken under the directorship of David Hall including the survey of the parish of Elm (Hall 1978).

In 1981 the largest ever programme of archaeological fieldwork within the county was commissioned by the Department of the Environment. The Fenland Project, chaired by John Coles, sought to conduct extensive field survey over the Fenland regions of Cambridgeshire as well as Lincolnshire and Norfolk, resulting in the discovery of over two and a half thousand sites (Hall and Coles 1994 p. 8). Further work was carried out during the 1980s and early 1990s throughout the county including the excavation of part of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Edix Hill Hole, Barrington (Malim and Hines 1998) following the discovery of grave goods by a local metal detectorist.

The state of British field archaeology changed completely in 1990 with the introduction of Planning Policy Guideline 16 (DOE 1990). Under this new system the responsibility for funding archaeological works fell to the developer rather than the state and quickly led to the establishment of a commercial archaeology. Whilst existing archaeological field groups adapted to these changes many new organisations were set up across the country to provide a contractual service to developers who found themselves liable for mounting costs of excavation work as part of their planning conditions. At least fourteen commercial archaeology units regularly work in the county (Tim Reynolds pers com) and their work has greatly increased the quantity of sites known in this area. The quality of their work, however, is variable and its usefulness within a broader research framework has yet to be assessed.




Figure 1: The political and physical geography of the Cambridgeshire region

2 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

2.1 Introduction

Anyone involved in the interpretation of archaeological data is aware that the processes responsible for the recovery of material culture are variable and tend to favour certain types of finds over others. Assessing the degree to which our data accurately reflects those aspects of past life that we seek to understand is, therefore, an important and necessary part of any archaeological inquiry. This is certainly an area that material culture specialists have concerned themselves, through, for example, studies of taphonomic processes, recovery biases and variations in patterns of deposition.

The recovery of archaeological sites themselves is also the product of a wide range of factors. Cultural processes in the past, such as differences in the availability, nature and deposition of material culture can affect our ability to recover sites through excavation or field survey. Similarly modern activities such as development and patterns of landuse may also aid or hinder the discovery of archaeological sites, as can physical circumstances such as soil type and geology.

This paper will discuss some of the problems relating to the representativity of archaeological remains and their implications for the interpretation of this data. In particular it will concentrate upon the apparent break in the pattern of settlement that is thought to characterise the transition from Roman to Saxon in Southern England.

2.2 Sample bias, representativity and archaeological source criticism.

The study of sample bias and representativity is not new. Pioneering work into the effects of recent cultural practices on the archaeological record has, for example, been carried out in Denmark with excellent results. There, Badau has argued that the distribution of prehistoric monuments corresponds with changes in land use with an almost total absence of such sites from the areas of greatest agricultural activity (Badau 1985). Not only did intensive ploughing destroy many of the monuments in those areas, but this happened before they were considered important enough to record. The result is a lack of both the physical sites or any written record of their existence. (Badau 1985). The effects of landuse strategies on the archaeological record was summarised succinctly by Kristiansen into two groups; active factors that result in the disturbance of the ground and are typically destructive, and passive factors, which have a minimal impact on the ground but affect the ability to recover archaeological material (Kristiansen 1985).

Comparable research has been conducted within this country over the past decades and has been particularly stimulated by those working in field survey. This have shown that there are two main ways in which the recovered archaeological material may be unrepresentative, either due to factors affecting the recovery of material during field work or through the sampling and/or research strategies employed. The recovery of material during field work is obviously affected by the factors described by Kristiansen. The presence and absence of fresh water alluvial deposits along the Welland valley, for example, biases the recovery of sites through field survey in favour of Roman and later sites, which were established after the alluvium was laid down (Pryor *et al* 1985).

Cultural factors in the past will also impact upon artefact and site recovery. The use of durable building material such as stone and robust ceramics, which will survive better in the plough soil, makes sites more readily detected through field survey or site evaluation. This can create a situation where sites of certain types or periods may be more or less susceptible to archaeological detection than others, with the effect of biasing the data set. Steven Willis, for example, has argued that apparent increases in the number of sites in the Late Iron Age is partly related to changing pottery fabrics and differences in the types of features present on settlement sites, as well as changes in the pattern of artefact deposition (Willis 1997 p.209). Similarly Esmonde-Cleary has stated that a useful comparison of settlement patterns between the Iron Age and Romano-British periods is hampered by differences in the levels of pottery in use during this time (Esmonde-Cleary 1989 p.105). Some attempts to overcome these problems have been made, for example, Martin Millett has argued for a method of calibration to be used when comparing field survey data from different periods (Millett 1985).

By contrast biases inherent in sampling strategies and research designs are a product of modern cultural practice and should be more easily averted. Mills, for example, identified four types of bias within fieldwalking data, with surveys targeting known sites, specific types of site, certain types of soil/geology and an emphasis on sites rather than landscape (Mills 1985). Clearly these factors are not restricted to field survey alone but are common to archaeology as a whole.

It must also be remembered that site recovery may not be uniform across wide spatial areas as many of the factors affecting it operate on a more localised scale. Patterns of landuse, for example, are likely to change across relatively small areas, as are physical factors such as soil type and underlying geology. In particular development will vary greatly across any research area, in relation to modern cultural factors such as urban areas and communications as well as natural factors such as geology and mineral resources. Similarly the activities of those actively involved in the recovery of archaeological material is unlikely to display a uniform spatial distribution; the adage of antiquarian research taking place within a day's cycle ride should not be taken too lightly. Modern day antiquarians also display some patterning in their activities. Gurney, for example, has shown that the distribution of finds recovered by metal detecting is a greater reflection of the activities of metal detectorists than it is of site distribution in the past (Gurney 1997).

The situation is, therefore, very complicated. The recovery and integration of material into the archaeological record is the product of a wide range of factors, including cultural activities in the past and present as well as physical processes. To add to the confusion these factors are variable, with the potential to change across relatively small areas. With this in mind we will now examine a specific aspect of the archaeological record where these problems can be examined in greater detail.

Variation in the data set: Roman and Saxon archaeology.

That considerable differences exist in the archaeological information relating to Roman Britain and the Early Anglo-Saxon periods has long been noted. In 1937 J.N.L. Myres

wrote that much of the information for the Early Anglo-Saxon period came from cemeteries (Myres 1937). The fact that these words were echoed by Dominic Powlesland (1998) over fifty years later shows the extent to which this situation has remained largely unchanged. Not only are cemeteries the dominant type of site, they have also received a great deal of attention throughout much of the history of Anglo-Saxon archaeology. Cemeteries were used initially to plot the movement of peoples into post-Roman Britain (e.g. Myres), then to understand their social structure (e.g. Arnold 1980, etc) and, most recently, the ethnic character of the Early Anglo-Saxon world (e.g. Harke 1991). Indeed, before 1923 there were no settlements dated to the Early Anglo-Saxon period and even today the number of fully excavated and published settlements is small (Higham 1992; Powlesland 1998).

By contrast the archaeology of the Roman period is very much the archaeology of settlement sites and, in particular, military fortifications, towns and villas. In both overall numbers and in the range of different types these occur with far greater frequency than in the following centuries and this has had a major effect upon the way in which we study the relationship between the two periods. Coupled with the apparent abandonment of so many Late Roman sites the decline in the number of known settlements between the Roman and Saxon periods has been taken as evidence for either a collapse in the rural economy (e.g. Newman 1988) or a change in the pattern of land use characterised by a shift to fewer sites on new locations (Higham 1992 p.113). Whilst such interpretations are partly the product of our own system of historical periodisation (Taylor forthcoming) they would appear to be supported by the available evidence.

There are, however, good reasons to suppose that variation in site numbers is not just a reflection in the overall pattern of social activity during that time. A range of cultural factors in the past could account for the decrease in known sites. The collapse of the Roman pottery industry and the use of hand made, locally produced ceramics in the Early Anglo-Saxon period is well attested (eg Fulford 1979) and will have two major effects upon site recovery. First, there was less pottery in circulation in the fifth and sixth centuries than in the Late Roman period. Secondly, the available pottery was less robust and does not survive well, particularly in the plough soil. Both will make Roman sites more visible archaeologically than those of the following centuries. Add to this the strong research emphasis on settlements of the Roman period, and the difference in settlement numbers become as much the product of archaeological inquiry as it is a reflection of past social change. In order to examine these issues in greater detail the remainder of this paper will look more closely at the differences between the archaeology of the Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon periods in Cambridgeshire.

2.3 Problems of dating in the Anglo-Saxon sample

A significant proportion of the Anglo-Saxon sites within the study area were poorly dated and could not be ascribed, with any degree of certainty, to the Early Anglo-Saxon period. An initial assessment of this material was, therefore, carried out with the aim of determining whether either the omission or inclusion of the insecurely dated sites would bias the data sample. This has concentrated upon the degree of variation between the

securely and poorly dated sites in terms of the method of their discovery, patterns of deposition and spatial distribution.

To begin with it is clear that there is little difference in the types of sites within each group, with both containing similar numbers of settlements and funerary sites (figure 2). This comparison remains even when the sites are examined in greater detail (figure 3) as all but three types of site are found in both groups. Of these the first, a mould, is unique to the entire dataset and the second, a multiple pottery scatter, occurs only once, making it unlikely that these finds will affect any further analysis. The third type of find, sites represented by occupation debris, is more significant as it occurs nine times (accounting for almost 20% of the poorly dated settlement sites). The most significant difference between the two groups is the larger number of metalwork finds that are poorly dated, almost twice the number that are securely dated to the Early Anglo-Saxon period. Further analysis of the data makes it clear that in both the dated and undated groups almost all the metalwork finds have been recovered by non archaeological means (figure 4). They are, therefore, unprovenanced and lack the degree of analysis which finds recovered archaeologically are likely to receive. Thus, the high proportion of poorly metalwork finds is, to a large extent, representative of that type of data and the means by which it is recovered.

The effect of the method of discovery on the dating of a site can be clearly demonstrated (figure 5). As might be expected a greater number of the securely dated sites have been discovered through excavation and field walking than those sites that are poorly dated.

This can be seen more clearly by a closer examination of the types of sites and the method by which they were discovered (figure 6). Within the securely dated sample the majority of settlement sites were discovered by excavation or field walking whilst the means of discovery of funerary sites is almost equally split between excavation and non archaeological recovery. By contrast the single most common form of discovery for all poorly dated sites is by non archaeological methods. Perhaps surprisingly, the accuracy of the dating of the Anglo-Saxon sites does not appear to relate to the date at which they were discovered. Apart from the 1920s, comparable numbers of sites with both secure and poor dates were discovered for each decade of this century (figure 7).

With the exception of the sites identified by the recovery of occupation debris from the plough soil the deposition of material culture in both securely and poorly dated sites appears to be the same. Settlement sites are known from Grubenhauser (or sunken featured buildings) or post built structures. The occurrence of metal objects recovered from an archaeological context also shows a common pattern with the majority of metalwork from each group being recovered from a funerary context (figure 8).

Similarly the spatial distribution of both securely and poorly dated Anglo-Saxon sites shows a common pattern (figure 9). In both groups the pattern of distribution is largely riverine, few sites lying either on the higher ground or within the Fenland areas in the north west of the county.

In summary, although there is some difference between those sites securely dated to the Early Anglo-Saxon period and those not, this can be partly explained in terms of the recovery of metal objects through non archaeological means. It is also clear that in general terms there is a great deal of conformity in the types of sites represented in each group, the means by which they were recovered, the deposition of material culture (in particular metal objects) and in their spatial distribution. Whilst it is not possible to determine how many of the poorly dated sites belong to the Early Anglo-Saxon period the high level of uniformity makes it unlikely that the inclusion of any later Anglo-Saxon sites will significantly bias further analysis into the factors affecting the recovery of sites.

2.4 Over and under-representation within the data set

2.4.1 Settlements

The number of fourth century settlements dominates the data set and accounts for almost 80% of the known archaeology of the Late Roman period (figure 10). When compared to the number of contemporary funerary sites, which make up less than 7% of the data set, the enormous number of Late Roman cemeteries immediately begins to look disproportionate. By contrast, settlements make up less than 30% of the Early Anglo-Saxon sample compared with funerary sites, which make up just less than 42%. Whilst these figures would appear to be more proportionate it has been shown that much of the remaining 28% of the Early Anglo-Saxon sample, which is made up of stray finds of metalwork, probably come from as yet undiscovered cemeteries. The number of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements is, therefore, disproportionately low, both in comparison with the numbers of known cemeteries and in relation to the number of Roman sites.

Whilst some difference between the number of Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements might be explained by reference to past economic and social factors, this is unlikely to be the sole cause, given the overwhelming dominance of the Late Roman sites within the assemblage. Nor can cultural factors easily explain the high numbers of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in relation to those from the Roman period. Instead it is necessary to examine some of the issues relating to their deposition, discovery and inclusion into the archaeological record.

One of the clearest indicators of recovery bias comes from a comparison of the principal means of site discovery. Whilst these are broadly comparable there are several notable differences in the ways in which sites of the two periods are being discovered. The first of these is in the proportion of sites discovered through fieldwalking. Within the Late Roman assemblage this method is responsible for the discovery of approximately the same number of sites as excavation (figure 11). However, only half as many Early Anglo-Saxon sites are discovered in through field survey in comparison with the numbers of sites discovered through excavation. This suggests that post-Roman settlements are less susceptible to recovery by fieldwalking than fourth century sites.

The ability to detect Anglo-Saxon settlements by field survey has been discussed many times in the past (eg Foard 1978) and it is largely agreed that sites of this period are under-represented because of the following factors;

- Less pottery in circulation
- Absence of building material
- Pottery that degrades quickly in the plough soil
- Less deep cut features

In other words there is often less material to detect, and what is there quickly degrades. This can be demonstrated by examining the sort of data that is recovered by field survey. Almost 60% of all fourth century settlements discovered by fieldwalking contained other material in addition to pottery (figure 12). By contrast almost three quarters of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements discovered by fieldwalking contained only pottery. In other words, whilst the absence of other material is making Early Anglo-Saxon sites less likely to be discovered the presence of a wider range of material culture on Late Roman sites may be aiding their recovery, increasing the bias within the sample.

Another reason for under-representation within the fieldwalking sample is that the majority of those sites discovered were recorded by the Fenland Project (figures 13 and 14). Whilst this covered a large portion of the county it was restricted to a specific region, one which may be seen as forming a different sort of environment from the rest of the county. The proportion of fourth century to Early Anglo-Saxon settlements discovered by the Fenland Project is 9.25:1, considerably greater than the overall ratio of settlements of the two periods which is just over 3.5:1. Whether this means that the Fenland Project was particularly biased against Early Anglo-Saxon settlements because of survey technique, taphonomic processes or because the area was abandoned after the Roman period remains

unclear. What can be said, however, is that the presence of the Fenland Project data in the archaeological record for the county is partly responsible for the overall under-representation of Early Anglo-Saxon sites in the county. A further bias resulting from the inclusion of the Fenland Project data is exhibited by the spatial patterning of settlements. As the fieldwalking undertaken by the project was limited to the Fenland areas, these parts of the county must be better represented than others. This can be clearly seen in the distribution of sites discovered through field survey (figure 15)

The ratio of Late Roman to Early Anglo-Saxon fieldwalked sites, excluding those discovered by the Fenland Project, is just over 3.5:1, similar to the overall proportions of settlements throughout the county. It is also similar to the ratio of sites discovered through excavation, which is just over 3.3:1. If fieldwalking in general is under-representing Early Saxon sites it is no more biased than excavation.

A second difference between the recovery factors of the two periods are the numbers of sites discovered through excavation. Over 44% of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements are discovered in this way as opposed to just over 33% of the Late Roman settlements (see figure 11). This difference is, in part, due to the large number of fieldwalked sites within the Late Roman assemblage. Yet it is also possible to show that these figures are the result of very recent changes in site recovery.

A closer examination of the pattern of site recovery shows that throughout much of this century a far greater proportion of Late Roman sites have been discovered through

excavation than those dating to the Early Anglo-Saxon period (figure 16 and see below). Only in the last decade has this situation changed, with almost 40% of all Early Anglo-Saxon settlement discovered since 1990. By contrast, just under 10.5% of fourth century sites were discovered by excavation since this time, demonstrating a slight decline in the pattern of recovery of settlements of this period. Furthermore, in the 1990s there were more Early Anglo-Saxon settlements discovered than Late Roman ones. In other words, the characteristic pattern of settlement numbers between the two periods has changed dramatically.

This has an important implication for understanding the nature of the differences in site numbers between the two periods. The 1990s witnessed what is undoubtedly the most important change for archaeological practice in this country, the introduction of developer-funded excavation. Whatever the problems with the process of competitive tendering, site evaluation and excavation, PPG16 has been responsible for a vast increase in the amount of archaeology that has been undertaken in this country. However, an increase in the level of fieldwork should affect the numbers of sites of both periods that are being recovered, and this is clearly not the case. Instead there must be some difference in the actual practice of archaeology that has made it easier to detect Early Anglo-Saxon settlements.

As has already been discussed, one of the reasons why Early Anglo-Saxon sites are under-represented by fieldwalking is their lower visibility, due to changes in the nature and deposition of material culture. These factors are also likely to affect their recovery

through excavation, not just because visibility is an important aspect of excavation but also because excavation often targets known areas of archaeological importance. The increase in the recovery of Early Anglo-Saxon sites must, therefore, be related to this issue of visibility and identification. Through PPG16, great emphasis is placed upon sampling areas even where there is little or no known archaeology and this is likely to be one of the main reasons for the higher numbers of Early Anglo-Saxon sites being recovered.

Whilst it is difficult to quantify the extent to which Early Anglo-Saxon sites are under-represented in the data set in comparison to Late Roman sites, it is possible to show that such an under-representation exists. Differences in the numbers of settlement sites are, therefore, a product of recovery factors rather than of real differences in settlement and land-use in the past.

2.4.2 *Cemeteries*

As was already discussed, whilst the Early Anglo-Saxon period is characterised by relatively low numbers of settlements when compared to the later Roman period, the evidence from cemeteries is quite the opposite. Cemeteries make up well over 40% of the Early Anglo-Saxon assemblage and this figure is likely to be higher when it is considered that a considerable proportion of the metal work finds (which make up almost 30% of the data set for the period) come from as yet undiscovered funerary areas (see figure 10). By contrast Roman cemeteries make up under 7% of the known archaeology for that period and, when viewed in relation to the number of settlements, are clearly under-represented archaeologically.

As with settlement numbers, it is possible to show why cemeteries of one period are better represented than those of another through an examination of the major means of discovery. In both periods cemeteries are far better represented through non-archaeological discovery than the contemporary settlements (figure 17). These figures should not surprise us: the presence of human remains makes a site highly visible, and social taboos make it harder to ignore their presence than if, for example, a developer had come across some pot sherds and building material. Yet this does not explain why Late Roman cemeteries are so poorly represented both in relation to the contemporary settlements and to cemeteries of the Early Anglo-Saxon period.

The answer to this undoubtedly lies in the differences in the funerary ritual of these two periods. In the fourth century the predominant form of funerary practice was inhumation with few, if any, accompanying grave goods. In the following centuries many aspects of funerary behaviour changed, with an rise in cremation and an increase in the numbers of objects that were deposited with the dead. Cremations of this period were typically placed in ceramic urns, which have been extensively studied. Similarly many of the objects that were placed in graves of the Early Anglo-Saxon period have been the subject of considerable research. Both they, and by association the related graves, are therefore more easily identifiable and datable than the burial sites of the preceding Roman period. This in turn facilitates their recovery and integration into the archaeological record.

Unlike settlement sites it is not possible to show any major changes in the pattern of site recovery for cemeteries of either period. Yet, when the numbers of funerary sites are

compared with the contemporary settlements it is clear that there are major differences in the factors that affect the discovery of material from the two periods. Cemetery numbers are, therefore, as much a product of site recovery as the settlements, and are unlikely to reflect real changes in population levels or demographic trends.

2.5 The data set through time

Whilst the nature of the archaeology will affect its recovery and inclusion in the sample, the activities of archaeologists also play a large part in defining the nature of the dataset. This would appear to be an obvious point as it is the explicit intention of archaeology to develop a sounder understanding of the past through the material traces that survive today. It is also clear that future work will drastically alter the way the past is viewed as new sites are discovered and developments in archaeological method lead to a greater recovery of information.

It is clear that the recovery of archaeological data over time has not been uniform with material from each period showing distinct peaks (figure 18). This is not only true of the overall recovery of material but also of the different types of site represented by the finds (figures 19 and 20). A number of distinct peaks in site recovery dominate the assemblages for both periods. Within the Early Anglo-Saxon finds (figure 20) cemeteries and finds of metalwork dominate the assemblage until the 1950's when, for the first time, finds indicative of settlement activity outnumber those from a funerary context. Furthermore, the nineteenth century accounts for a high proportion of funerary sites and metalwork finds. This corresponds with the observation made by Myres that the

archaeology for the period, at the time he was conducting his research, came predominantly from cemeteries (Collingwood and Myres 1937 p.330). By contrast the Roman assemblage is dominated by discoveries made in the 1980s (largely the result of the Fenland Project), though from the 1950's there was a sharp increase in the recovery of sites (figure 20). Similarly the methods by which the information is recovered also changes over time (figures 21 and 22). As with the types of finds, which were discussed earlier, the data from each period shows different trends that reflect the nature of both the material and contemporary archaeological work.

2.5.1 The Nineteenth Century

The Early Anglo-Saxon assemblage from the nineteenth century is made up of funerary and metalwork finds recovered predominantly by non-archaeological means but also through excavation (figure 26). This material falls into two main areas, along the River Cam and in the north west of the county, close to Peterborough (figure 23). In both areas the finds are largely the result of development, particularly around the city of Cambridge (e.g. Girton cemetery) (Meaney 1964. p.65) or aggregate and brick earth extraction along the course of the river valleys (e.g. Barrington) (Foster 1880).

In contrast to the Early Anglo-Saxon data the Roman sites discovered at this time are predominantly settlements and were more often recovered through excavation, (though non-archaeological recovery makes up for a significant proportion of the sites) (figure 26). Furthermore, almost all of the excavated sites lie in the north west of the county, around the area of Durobrivae (figure 23).

2.5.2 1900-1949

For the first half of this century slightly more Early Anglo-Saxon material was recovered than Late Roman. Again the method of recovery provides a partial explanation with the majority of Early Anglo-Saxon finds coming up accidentally whilst Roman sites continued to be discovered through excavation.

The concentration of Early Anglo-Saxon sites continues to fall in the north west of the county and along the Cam and Cam/Rhee (figure 24). It is clear, however, that finds from this period are beginning to appear in other locations such as Linton in the far south west of the county as well as further north on the Cam and along the Ouse. The nature of the Early Anglo-Saxon sites changes in this period with the discovery of the first settlements, though cemeteries and stray finds continue to dominate the assemblage. Similarly the Roman sites show a new distribution with finds spots along the Ouse. It is clear, however, that Roman sites continue to be very scarce along the Cam.

2.5.3 1950-Present

This period accounts for the largest numbers of sites of both periods within the dataset, the largest number of excavated sites and the widest distribution across the county (figure 25). The reasons for this rise are numerous and complex but a number of important factors can be demonstrated.

Firstly, post-war development and the establishment of New Towns such as Peterborough have had a tremendous effect upon the recovery of archaeological material. Though much of the city of Peterborough is Victorian, work on the New Town began in the 1970s and

continues to this day (Peterborough City Planning Dept.). The effect of this development on the archaeology of the region can not be understated with the well known prehistoric sites at Fengate, Maxey and Flag Fen all discovered during this development. The effect of urban growth in this area on the Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon material can be clearly demonstrated with the 1970s producing twenty seven percent of all the sites within the district of Peterborough (figure 27). Of these, twenty two percent were discovered within the city area itself. Further analysis adds credence to the view that the development in the 1970s had an effect on the archaeological record for the Peterborough area. To begin with, the number of sites recovered by excavation rose sharply in the 1960s with a significant peak in the 1970s. Furthermore, the number of sites recovered by non-archaeological means drops suggesting that more finds were being reported and, subsequently excavated.

Secondly, a number of field survey projects were carried out in the county, such as the Fenland Project, the Elm survey and the Soke of Peterborough survey. As was discussed earlier, the Fenland Project (the results of which incorporate the earlier Elm survey) accounts for a significant proportion of the settlement sites dated to the Late Roman period but, whilst it recovered over three quarters of all field-walked Early Anglo-Saxon settlements, its effect on the overall number of settlements of this period was low. The Fenland Project surveyed almost one third of the county (Hall and Coles 1994) but was confined to the Fen and Fen edge, an area which may be regarded as a distinct environment and one which may have had different influences upon settlement than the river valleys and upland areas which characterise the rest of the county.

Finally the role of development on the creation of the archaeological record changed dramatically in 1990 with the implementation of Planning Policy Guideline 16. Under PPG16 the responsibility for the preservation of archaeology, either through recording or in situ preservation, falls with the developer if it is felt by the planning authority that such development will have a significant impact on the archaeology of that area (DOE 1990).

Any attempt to understand the degree to which developer-funded excavation has influenced the archaeological record must, therefore, take into account the number of instances where the planning authority felt the impact on the archaeology to be minimal. Furthermore, it would also be necessary to quantify the number of cases where development proceeded without prior investigation of the site but where archaeology was still disturbed. There are a number of cases where development takes place without archaeological work being carried out. As a general rule a development consisting of less than two buildings is not considered a significant impact and will not be considered for any investigation (CCC. Planning Dept.). There are also economic reasons for refusing to implement PPG16, (which, as it is a guideline, is not a legal requirement unless it is included within a planning application). In Godmanchester, for example, the local council has stated that archaeology will not stop development from taking place (Tim Reynolds. pers. comm.) In other words, the economic benefit of development is given a priority over the recovery of archaeological material.

Though the effects of PPG16 are difficult to assess there is a significant change in the methods used to recover Early Anglo-Saxon material during the 1990s. The discovery of almost one quarter of all the Early Anglo-Saxon settlements (figure 22), and just under half of all such sites that were recovered by excavation took place between 1990 and 1998 (figure 15). The figures for sites dated to the Roman period do not, however, match this trend with the number of sites discovered by excavation in the 1990s not being greater than any other decade since the 1950s with the exception of the 1980s (figure 21). One possible reason for this is that Roman sites have always been well represented by excavation and PPG16 has simply made the numbers of Early Anglo-Saxon sites more representative. However, as commercial archaeology is largely determined by patterns of land use and development the distribution of archaeological sites may become increasingly biased towards certain areas (figure 28).

It is also clear that a significant number of sites continue to be discovered by non-archaeological means. On the face of it this would appear strange, as PPG16 should result in less sites being reported after their discovery, and subsequent destruction, by developers. However, the majority of Early Anglo-Saxon finds discovered by non-archaeological means during this period are metal objects, the numbers of which rise considerably during the 1980s and 1990s and are likely to be the product of metal-detecting as a hobby.

Finally, the later half of this century shows a broadening of the distribution of finds belonging to both periods. Whilst the distributions still show a density in the north west

of the county this is, in part, due to the effects of post-war urban development which was discussed earlier. The concentration of sites along the Cam is also still present. The overall distribution, however, is far wider than for the preceding periods with greater numbers of finds along the Ouse as well as further away from the rivers (figure 25). That this is due to developer-funded excavation, urban development or any other single factor is unlikely but it probably represents a combination of the activities of local archaeology groups, universities, metal detectorists, local authorities and commercial archaeology.

2.6 Conclusion

Though this analysis has not been exhaustive it has shown that the factors affecting the recovery of archaeological information and its inclusion into the dataset are not uniform, either in relation to the two periods, or within the practice of archaeology over the past two centuries. Each period is under-represented by one form of site, settlements in the Early Anglo-Saxon assemblage and cemeteries in the Late Roman one, and the number of Roman settlements dominates the data from both periods. The high incidence of metalwork on Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites makes excavated sites easier to date and forms a good basis for the inference of such sites through stray finds, increasing the number of sites known and making the contemporary settlements appear to be under-represented. This imbalance between settlements and cemeteries is increased because of the low survival rate of Early Anglo-Saxon ceramics in the plough soil, making them difficult to detect through field-walking. By contrast, Late Roman settlements are well known because the pottery of this period is easy to date, survives well in the plough soil and is often found in association with other artefacts indicative of settlement activity.

Artefact recovery has also changed during the course of the past two hundred years due to the increased 'professionalism' and, later, commercialism, of archaeology as a discipline resulting in significant changes in recovery method. Extensive field surveys, carried out in the 1970's and 80's across the county have resulted in large numbers of Late Roman sites being discovered but the areas covered and the methods used may have been biased towards the recovery of Late Roman material.



Figure 2: The numbers of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites by basic category




Figure 3: Numbers of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites by type.




Figure 4: Method of discovery of metalwork finds within the Anglo-Saxon sample.




Figure 5: Method of discovery of all Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites.




Figure 6: Method of discovery of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites by category of site.




Figure 7: Numbers of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered each decade.




Figure 8: Recorded instances of metal objects on Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon settlement and funerary sites.




Figure 9: Distribution of Early and possibly Early Anglo-Saxon Sites.




Figure 10: Numbers of sites of each category by period. All Anglo-Saxon sites have been included.




Figure 11: Percentage of settlements of each period and the method of discovery.




Figure 12: Numbers of sites discovered by field walking where pottery and other artefacts have been recorded.




Figure 13: Total number of sites discovered by field walking and the number recorded by the Fenland Project.




Figure 14: Total numbers of fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements discovered by field walking and the numbers recorded by the Fenland Project.




Figure 15: Distribution of all sites discovered through fieldwalking




Figure 16: Percentage of settlements of each period discovered through excavation since the nineteenth century.




Figure 17: Percentage of cemeteries of each period and the method of discovery.




Figure 18: Date of discovery of all fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites.




Figure 19: Date of discovery of fourth century sites by category.




Figure 20: Date of discovery of all Early Anglo-Saxon sites by category.




Figure 21: Date of discovery of fourth century sites by the method of discovery.




Figure 22: Date of discovery of all Early Anglo-Saxon sites by the method of discovery.




Figure 23: Distribution of all fourth century and early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered in the nineteenth century




Figure 24: Distribution of all Fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered between 1900 and 1949




Figure 25: Distribution of all Fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered between 1950 and 1998




Figure 26: Method of discovery of fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites during the nineteenth century.




Figure 27: Numbers of fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon sites discovered in the Peterborough City district through time and the method of discovery.




Figure 28: Plan showing archaeological activity in Cambridgeshire.
(After Davis 1998)

3 INTERPRETING THE DATASET

3.1 Introduction

Broadly speaking, the aim of this chapter is to move from an understanding of the dataset in terms of the recovery of sites to what these finds mean in terms of social activity in the past. More specifically, it seeks to answer two questions. The first is what do the individual, and often fragmentary, finds represent? Do all sites with finds indicative of settlement activity, for example, form similar types of settlement or is there some evidence for variation in the types of settlement or settlement related activity. Furthermore, where finds are found in close association do these form part of the same site? The second focuses on the spatial distribution of the sites, partly to answer the first question and partly to examine the pattern of landuse. For example, are sites distributed equally across the research area or is there evidence for areas with a higher density of activity?

3.2 Method

In order to achieve these aims the dataset has been broken down into three groups (as described in chapter 1); settlements, funerary sites and metalwork finds. Settlements have been further sub-divided into three categories; settlement features (sites with post-built structures and other features such as sunken featured buildings, pits or ditches), sunken featured buildings (finds of these structures without any associated features) and surface scatters of material culture. Similarly funerary sites have been sub-divided into single burials and group burials (the latter being any site with two or more burials). These have then been examined, using the methodology described below, in order to determine

whether these divisions represent real differences in cultural practices or whether they are the product of the fragmentary nature of the finds.

The methodology for this section consists of three parts. The first was an examination of the general problems associated with interpreting sites, drawing upon current debates and the results of excavated settlements and cemeteries. The second examined the spatial distribution of the sites by measuring the distance from each site to the next closest site of each type. This analysis was undertaken in order to observe both the general pattern of distribution across the research area and the spatial relationships both within and between the different types of site. Average distances between sites were compared with trends in the spatial distributions in order to show any evidence for a clustering of sites. Where possible the results from several regions of the research area were compared allowing any variation in the pattern of distribution to be observed. Drawing upon the results of the first two parts of the analysis the third stage began an interpretation of the dataset in order to fulfil the aims outlined above. This also looked at the individual sites in greater detail, in particular the method of recovery, the extents of the excavated area and the presence or absence of contemporary finds in the immediate area.

3.3 Settlement sites: overview

3.3.1 Distributions and site densities

The classic pattern of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements observed through much of southern and eastern England is characterised by low numbers of sites scattered thinly along the courses of rivers, avoiding the higher grounds and favouring lighter, well drained soils.

Chris Scull's review of the East Anglian evidence (Scull 1992) (figure 29) and Welch's study of the Sussex landscape (Welch 1983) show the same riverine pattern of settlement, which is also argued by West, for the Lark Valley (West 1985). Whilst site recovery can be shown to be a reflection of recent cultural activity, the evidence from recent field-walking surveys shows a similar pattern. In the Suffolk Sandlings field survey has identified a number of sites, often thinly spaced, sited close to water courses and away from the heavier clay soils (Newman 1992) (figure 30). Intensive field survey carried out in Essex showed similar results with Early Anglo-Saxon sites tending to favour the lighter soils of the lowlands, with far fewer discovered on the heavier upland soils (Williamson 1986). In this case, however, it has been argued that the survey strategy itself as well as cultural factors may have influenced this apparent distinction in site location (Williamson 1986 p.127).

The results of both intensive field survey and broader, regional surveys, whilst showing general similarities in site location, do exhibit localised examples of more intensive activity. The distribution of settlements recorded in the Suffolk Sandlings reveals two small groups of sites whilst other areas are marked by a conspicuous lack of activity. (Newman 1992), a pattern that can be expanded upon by examination of excavated sites. Excavations at the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at Mucking revealed settlement features spread out over a distance of one kilometre (Jones 1980; Hamerow 1993a) (figure 31) with the density of features varying considerably within this area. Immediately to the south of the excavated area sunken featured and post built structures had been previously discovered (Hamerow 1993a) probably forming part of the same site. Less than a

kilometre to the north west five Early Anglo-Saxon sunken featured were discovered at Orsett 'Cock' (Carter 1998) (figure 32), four more and a possible post built structure were excavated close by at Boyn Hill (Toller 1980) and at least three others were recorded at Barrington Farm (Milton 1987). Further settlement features are known at West Tillbury, just over one kilometre to the south west of Mucking (Jones 1980; Hamerow 1993a). Likewise, at West Stow, two sunken featured buildings and a possible post-built structure were discovered less than 600m from the main site and have been interpreted as a short lived outlier to the settlement (West 1985). Whilst these features were not all in use at the same time they represent a significant concentration of settlement activity for a period that is characterised by so few sites of this type. However, it remains to be seen whether these sites represent a typical settlement density that might be envisaged in other areas of the country or whether such localised clusters or concentrations of sites are an aspect of the cultural landscape. Furthermore, we should be cautious of interpreting all settlement-related finds as evidence for settlements per se, rather than considering the possibility that some features are the product of off site activity. The density of features at Orsett is much lower than that observed at Mucking (Carter 1998) suggesting a difference in the nature of the site whilst the finds at West Stow are of a sufficiently small scale to suggest some ancillary or off-site function associated with the main settlement site rather than a separate settlement area. This might suggest a deliberate distinction between the settlement, which acted as the main focus for cultural activity and other areas of the landscape where certain tasks took place. However, the morphology of many settlement sites shows considerable variation in both the density and distributions of features of different type. At Mucking the central area of

the site shows a much thinner distribution of features, with a much higher proportion of sunken featured buildings than is observed elsewhere (Hamerow 1993) and at West Heslerton a group of sunken featured buildings to the north of the site forms a distinct zone, within which no post-built structures were recorded (Powlesland 1996) (figure 33). Partial excavation over areas of these sites would produce differing results, in terms of both the density and the character of the features. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the context of the site, in particular the nature of the discovery and the extents of the area investigated before making any statement regarding the character of the site. In terms of the Orsett Cock finds, the large size of the area and the fact that the discoveries were the result of archaeological investigation would suggest that the character of the site is different to that observed at Mucking, and that the Orsett finds are indicative of some form of off-site or ancillary activity.

3.3.2 Building types and functional interpretations

Two main structural forms are found within almost all fifth and sixth century sites; sunken featured buildings and above ground post-built structures. Post-built structures exhibit a range of sizes but are generally three times as long as they are wide (Powlesland 1996) (figure 34). The presence of hearths within these structures is known in a few cases, such as West Stow Halls 2 and 5 (West 1985 p.11) but are usually absent, with none recorded at either Mucking or West Heslerton (Hamerow 1993; Powlesland 1996). Whilst this may be attributed to the poor excavation conditions at Mucking (where most of the sub-soil was removed), this can not be the case at West Heslerton where substantial areas of the sites were sealed by an occupation layer or buried soil (Powlesland 1996). No evidence for floor surfaces has been noted within these structures, despite the excellent

opportunities at West Heslerton, which along with the absence of hearths in many structures, suggests that these buildings had a raised or supported floor (Powlesland 1996). The lack of associated material culture or any direct relationship between form and function makes interpretation of these structures problematic and, whilst they are generally regarded as the living places, or houses, of the fifth and sixth century population, this should not rule out further activities taking place within them.

Sunken featured buildings (also known as Grubenhauser or sunken floored buildings) were the first settlement features identified by excavation (Leeds 1923) and were originally interpreted as the dwellings of the Anglo-Saxons. The structures are characterised by a rectangular or sub-oval pit, varying in depth between 25 and 55cm, often with associated post-holes that may have supported a tent-like roof (figure 35). Considerable debate still rages about the structural form of these buildings with Leeds, Lethbridge and other pioneers in the study of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements interpreting the base of the pits as the floor of the structure (Leeds 1923, 1925; Lethbridge 1927 p.141), an interpretation supported by the wear marks and erosion in the base of a small number of these features (e.g., Mucking, Essex GH 42, 72, 105, 197 and 201 (Hamerow 1993a p.11)), occasional hearths, (e.g. Linford, Essex (Barton 1962 p.72), Sutton Courtenay, Berkshire House X, room 11 (Leeds 1923 p.172) Rook Hall, Essex (Tyler 1996 p.114-5)) and lines of loom weights discovered in the lower fills of the deposits (e.g. Mucking, Essex GH 84 (Hamerow 1993a p.68)). An alternative interpretation has been suggested by West, who argues that the floor of the building was raised over the pit on wooden planks creating either a storage space or allowing air to circulate keeping the

structure dry (West 1985). This interpretation is based upon the lack of erosion of both the sides and base of some of the West Stow structures, fully articulated dog skeletons that might have decayed in a 'protected hollow space' (i.e. beneath the raised floor of a sunken featured building) (West 1985 p.120) and two hearths that appeared to have collapsed into the pit from above (West 1985 p.120). As West himself admits, this is not to suggest that every building of this type had a raised floor (West 1985 p.120), indeed, this may vary with either ground conditions, function, or both.

Further debate surrounds the function of these structures, as Leeds and others believed that they were a simple form of dwellings, with the inhabitant living within a gradually accumulating rubbish heap with no concept of 'cleanliness or comfort' (Lethbridge 1927 p.146). More recently Dixon has argued that the earliest sunken featured buildings at Mucking formed the original shelters of the migrants, constructed shortly after their arrival, and then later replaced by post built structures with the help of nearby Britons (Dixon 1996 p.141). Such interpretations were first questioned by Radford who argued that the deposits found within these structures suggested an industrial or craft producing function, (Radford 1957 p.36-38) an interpretation that still holds today. In his survey of Anglo-Saxon buildings Rahtz (1976) identified several functions ascribed to sunken featured buildings: living houses, barns, byres, weaving-sheds, spinning-huts, store-houses, bake-houses, pottery workshops, loom-weight manufactories, iron working, lead working and antler working workshops, all largely based on the nature of the associated finds and the differences in size and construction technique (Rahtz 1976 p.76.). However, interpretation on the basis of the material culture associated with these features must be

called into question as it assumes that both the structure and deposit containing the material culture are functionally related and recent research has shown that the deposits within the structures must have formed after the building had gone out of use. By analysing the pottery from sunken featured buildings, Tipper has shown that many of the deposits accumulated from deliberate deposition of material as dumps in a number of separate episodes (Tipper forthcoming) rather than the gradual accumulation of material hypothesised by West (West 1985). Furthermore, the sheer volume of material deposited in these features suggests that the structure had already gone out of use by the time deposition occurred. Moreover, the nature of the material culture assemblage from such features shows a complex formation history reflecting differences in depositional activities. The finds of semi-articulated animal bone, presumably from butchering, and occasional fully-articulated animal remains show that some material was immediately deposited into the features. But other aspects of the assemblages are more fragmentary, including sherds from the same ceramic vessel found in different features (Tipper forthcoming) and the occasional finds of disarticulated human remains (e.g. at West Stow (West 1985 p.59), West Heslerton (Powlesland pers. Comm..) and Eye Kettleby (Finn forthcoming). These suggest that material was being collected, possibly in midden heaps, prior to its deposition in the buildings and that in some cases material was redeposited following disturbance of the original context.

It is, therefore, rarely possible to interpret the function of a sunken featured buildings in terms of the deposits found within them, except where features such as hearths are cut directly into the floor of the feature. Instead, where finds indicative of specific activities

are located within such deposits it is possible to say only that such activities may have taken place within the settlement, though perhaps after the building had gone out of use. The nature of the deposits found within these features does suggest a level and type of cultural activity that is more likely to occur within or close to a settlement or other area of intensive activity. Unfortunately examination of the deposits of sunken featured building has concentrated on those found within excavated settlements making it difficult to extend the interpretations to those found in relative isolation.

Settlements or settlement activity can also be discerned from scatters of pottery and associated material culture recovered from the plough soil. Whilst these often lack any information concerning their depositional context there is evidence to suggest a direct relationship between such finds and settlement features. In Northamptonshire sunken featured and post-built structures were recorded during excavations of areas where pottery scatters had been identified by field-walking (Shaw 1994) and the sunken featured buildings excavated in the 1960s at Witton lay within areas of known ploughsoil scatters (Wade 1983). But this need not be the same in every case and material recovered from the plough zone may have been deposited as manure on fields, or in off-site rubbish tips or middens. The situation is, therefore, highly problematic, with no direct or necessary relationship between the available evidence and the cultural practices that we are trying to infer.

3.3.3 Settlement morphology

Though the number of settlements that have been excavated to anything near their entirety is very small, those that have show a range of morphological features. The site at

Mucking forms a linear arrangement of features, spreading out over a distance of over one kilometre but with a width of no more than four hundred and fifty metres (Hamerow 1993a) and the settlement appears to shift through this area during the fifth to the seventh centuries (Hamerow 1993) (figure 36). The distribution of structural features does show an apparent zone of sunken featured buildings in the south of the site, though associated post-built structures may occur beyond the limits of excavation and at least one was discovered at Linford, immediately to the south (Barton 1962). Both types of structure are, however, found in close association in the north of the area with a more dispersed pattern and a lower proportion of post-built structures observed in the middle of the site. The West Stow settlement exhibits a more even distribution of structural types with the sunken featured buildings found in association with each post-built structure or 'hall', and with no distinct zone of sunken featured buildings. As at Mucking the phasing of the site shows that it shifted over time but at both sites later activity continued in areas occupied in earlier phases (figure 37).

A different pattern is observed at West Heslerton, which has been described as a proto-town by the excavator (Powlesland 1998 p.110). Three distinct zones are suggested by the distribution of structural features: an industrial zone made up entirely of sunken featured buildings, a second zone where both types are found in close association and a higher status area with no sunken featured buildings (Powlesland 1996 p.58-61). This site also displays a greater degree of nucleation than is observed at either Mucking or West Stow possibly suggesting a difference in social or economic status. Dominic Powlesland has, however, argued that West Heslerton should be seen as the typical form of settlement

of this period, with other known sites forming partial fragments of larger settlements (Powlesland 1998 p.110).

In conclusion a number of points can be made relating to Early Anglo-Saxon settlements. Throughout much of southern England settlements sites appear to follow the course of rivers and favour well drained lighter soils and are generally found in small numbers. In several cases, however, sites lie close together, sometimes within one kilometre or less, suggesting a higher density of activity than is observed in other areas. Whether such finds represent multiple settlement sites (indicating a high site density) or a mixture of on- and off-site activity is debatable. The sites at Orsett and, perhaps, Witton show a lower density of features than settlements such as Mucking or West Heslerton and so may be the product of activities that were ancillary to the main settlements. However, settlement morphology varies both within and between sites so we must examine the context of any discoveries before interpreting them as either off-site activity areas or part of a larger settlement. The issue is exacerbated by the problems of interpreting sunken featured buildings. The deposits from these features are clearly associated with settlement activity but the relationship between these activities and the deposition of material within the structures is complex. Similarly interpreting pottery scatters in terms of settlements or off-site activity is problematic as features have been recorded within areas located by field walking but this need not be true of every case. Finally the sites that we see through excavation are the result of a dynamic process. Settlements such as Mucking and West Stow are the product of several centuries of activity, the focus of which shifts over time. Considering this mobility and the possibility of off-site activity areas lying close to

settlement sites, we must see the landscape as dynamic, with the character of spaces changing constantly.

3.4 Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement sites in Cambridgeshire

3.4.1 General distributions in the county

The overall pattern of settlement sites shows a distribution along the rivers and river tributaries of the county with the density of sites varying considerably (figure 38). Twenty three sites (almost thirty percent of the total number) are found in the north west of the county, along the Nene and Welland rivers whilst only eleven sites are found along the Cam/Rhee with ten more sites dispersed across the south east of the county, mostly lying on tributaries of the Cam or the line of the Cam/Granta as it heads into Essex. Settlement along the Fen edge is characterised by a thin scatter of sites, mainly following the line of the River Ouse, though the overall numbers are comparable with those observed in the south east. However only three sites are known from within the fens: Stonea, Whittlesey and Wood Walton (sites 532, 616 and 667). Site density is also lower in the west of the county with only eight sites lying to the west of Ermine Street, four of which lie on the route of the Ouse at Buckden (sites 40 and 41) and St. Neots, whilst the others lie further away.

Three main types of finds are suggestive of settlement activity; first, settlement features such as post built structures with or without associated ancillary features such as sunken featured buildings or pits, second, finds of sunken featured buildings either as single features or in small groups and, third, surface scatters of material culture. The latter group

can be subdivided into pottery and pottery with associated finds such as animal bones and burnt stone that might be characterised as occupation debris. Within the Nene/Welland valleys, where the density of sites is highest, settlements of all types are distributed fairly evenly, though sunken featured buildings are less well represented than either settlement features or finds scatters. Most sites lie within two kilometres of another, though some are more isolated lying between three and six kilometres from the closest site. Two groups or clusters of sites can be identified, at Orton Longueville and Castor, both of which are made up of six sites lying within a distance of between three and a half and four kilometres. Elsewhere in the area site distribution is somewhat thinner, with a more linear arrangement though the majority of sites still lie within two kilometres of at least one other site. The only Early Anglo-Saxon activity known from within the Roman town at Castor comes from a single, poorly dated pottery sherd (site 113) discovered at Normangate fields, the site of the Roman suburb, however, fifth century pottery (site 101) is known from the site of the Palatium close by.

Settlement in the northeast of the county is largely known through surface scatters, two of which follow the line of the Ouse (though they are set back at least two kilometres from its current course) with another two lying close to a tributary. Possible settlement features are known further north at Littleport (site 362) where air photographs show possible sunken featured buildings within a Roman ladder settlement (Hall 1996). The density of sites in this area is low with sites lying between five and a half and ten kilometres apart. Along the line of the Cam/Rhee settlement density rises slightly with many sites lying between two and three kilometres of the next closest site though larger distances (up to

five kilometres) occur in places. There is little evidence for concentrations of sites comparable with that observed along the Nene with the exception of Waterbeach where four sites (sites 591, 592, 594 and 595) lie within a twelve hundred metre area. Sites of all types are found in this part of the county, though settlement features are less well represented (only one site). There is no evidence for settlement within the Roman town at Cambridge and only poorly dated finds scatters located close by. In the east of the county sites are distributed along three rivers, giving the impression of three small groups, each made up of two or three sites lying between two and four kilometres apart. One other site (site 604) is found away from a water course and in apparent isolation, over six kilometres from the next nearest site. Interestingly this is the only site to lie above the fifty metre contour.

Along the line of the Ouse to Godmanchester the seven sites are evenly spaced between four and six kilometres apart, with each lying in relative isolation. Two sites (513 and 258) lie close to the coarse of the Ouse whilst others lie further to the south whilst sites 132 and 146 follow the coarse of a tributary running from the south into the Ouse at Cottenham. Only one sunken featured building (site 132) is known from this group with the rest being identified from finds scatters and settlement features. Settlement activity is known from the Roman town at Godmanchester (site 239) where structural evidence and associated material culture was recorded (Green 1975). In the west of the county very few sites are known with only seven sites within twenty kilometres. In two cases sites lie close together; at Buckden two finds of sunken featured buildings (sites 40 and 41) lie within twelve hundred metres of each other and at St. Neots a possible sunken featured

building lies less than three hundred metres from an scatter of Anglo-Saxon material. The remaining sites are far more isolated, lying between four and ten kilometres apart. Site type varies though settlement features are less well represented being found only at Gamlingay (site 225). The only area where the site density is lower is within the fens where only three sites are known, none of which is closer than seven and a half kilometres to another site. These sites are all different, with settlement features found at Stonea, Wimbleton (site 532); crop marks of possible sunken featured buildings at Whittlesey (site 617) and finds scatters at Wood Walton (site 667).

3.4.2 Spatial analysis

As was discussed earlier settlement activity is represented by three types of evidence; settlement features such as built structures, sites with just sunken featured buildings and surface scatters of material culture recovered by field survey. Due to the fragmentary nature of many of the excavations and the difficulty of interpreting field survey results it was not immediately apparent what these sites represented in terms of settlement activity. Where they, for example, representative of similar forms of settlement or were they produced by different aspects of social and economic activity in the past. In order to better understand the nature of these sites an analysis was carried out into the spatial relationships between them following the methodology outlined above.

To begin with the spatial distributions of all settlement sites, irrespective of the type of data that they contained, was examined (figure 39). This showed that almost one quarter of all settlements lay within five hundred metres of another and that the number of sites drops sharply beyond one and a half kilometres. This suggests two things. First, that

some sites may actually form part of the same settlement. Second, that in some areas at least there is evidence for a high site density and that settlements were often clustered close together. The steady decline in site numbers after one and a half kilometres may also mean that there were distinct areas of settlement activity. These observations are supported by the analysis of the distances between the different types of site.

3.4.2.1 Settlement features

Out of eighteen sites with settlement features, two lie within five hundred metres of each other and are, therefore, probably part of the same site, whilst a further four lie between one and a half and two kilometres apart (figure 40). Interestingly over half of the sites known from settlement features lie between one and a half and two and a half kilometres from the closest finds of pottery scatters (figure 42), corresponding with the trend in settlement distributions noted above. The distances between settlement features and sites known from sunken featured buildings is far more even but the peak in the number of sites between two kilometres and two and a half kilometres apart is evident (though this is only a rise from one to two sites) (figure 41). The remaining sites are too few in number and too widely spaced to be able to draw any meaningful conclusions.

A comparison between these results and the distribution of sites along the river Nene shows comparable results (figures 43-45). This, however, may be due to the fact that the Nene valley has the highest density of sites and, as such, is largely responsible for the pattern observed across the county

3.4.2.2 *Sunken featured buildings*

The relationship between the fifteen finds of sunken featured buildings appears to differ only slightly from that observed between finds of settlement features. No sunken featured building is located within one kilometre of the next nearest site of the same type whilst four sites (just over one quarter) are located between one and two and a half kilometres of the next closest site (figure 46). This is still, however, close enough for these sites to either form part of the same settlement or to indicate areas of high activity. The distances from sunken featured buildings to pottery scatters also shows a higher number of sites between one and a half and two and a half kilometres apart (figure 47).

3.4.2.3 *Surface scatters*

The spatial relationships between surface scatters of pottery is very different. Of thirty seven sites almost one quarter are located within five hundred metres of another (figure 48). No pottery finds are located between five hundred metres and two and a half kilometres of another and the numbers of sites remains low from two and a half kilometres onwards.

Interpreting these results is difficult given the low numbers and wide distribution of the sites as well as the fact that they represent only a sample of the true number of sites. A clear trend can, however, be observed in the distances between sites with many falling between one and two and a half kilometres. These are likely to represent areas of high activity. A number of sites also lie closer to each other and these may form parts of the same settlements. Apart from these generalised trends, however, it is not possible to

distinguish more subtle patterns such as those that might relate site type to spatial distribution.

3.4.3 Analysis of sites with settlement characteristics

The results of the spatial analysis show that over half the sites with settlement type evidence lie within two kilometres of the next closest site and that almost one quarter lie within five hundred metres of another site. Whilst the more detailed examination of spatial relationships, based on sites of each type, shows some variations, (which is in part due to the small numbers of sites and the large distance over which they are distributed) they generally fit into the same broad pattern. The discussion of settlement morphology and site density from elsewhere in the country has shown that sites often lie close to others, possibly representing off-site activity or dense areas of settlement. In the case of the Cambridgeshire data it is important to distinguish between those sites that represent part of the same site, but discovered at separate times and those which indicate either separate settlements sites or off-site activity.

Two pairs of sites known from finds of settlement features lie within five hundred metres of each other, at Orton Longueville (sites 411 and 412) and Hinxton Hall Park (sites 305 and 308). Site 411 was discovered during gravel extraction and few records relating to the excavations are known, the site is poorly dated, being described only as Anglo-Saxon and so may not be contemporary with site 412. This site was discovered earlier this century and shows some evidence for settlement activity in the form of post holes, pits and associated material culture, dated to the sixth and seventh centuries. The close proximity of these sites matches that observed in other parts of the country and though

the poor dating of site 411 makes interpretation problematic it is likely that site 411 represents part of the same settlement though perhaps occupied at a different time. At Hinxton Hall two post built structures and four sunken featured buildings were excavated during archaeological works carried out during the 1990s (site 305) (Evans 1993; Roberts 1995), roughly four hundred metres from the location of another post built structure (site 308) that lay within a Late Roman field system (SMR Cambs). Whilst only a limited excavation was carried out at site 308 no other contemporary features were recorded and it is likely that this building stood alone, beyond the edge of the main settlement area and may be considered as ancillary to the main settlement area.

Only one site of settlement features is found within five hundred metres of a sunken featured building. This occurs at Castor where fifth century pottery shows the continued occupation/activity in the area of the Palatium (site 101), three hundred and fifty metres from a possible sunken featured building discovered on the site of a Late Roman structure (site 108) (SMR Peterborough). The nature of the activity at the Palatium is difficult to gauge, due to the small scale of the excavations, and whilst the fourth century surfaces and features were still in use at this particular part of the site there is no evidence for the continued use of the site on anywhere near the same scale as in the preceding centuries (SMR Peterborough). The evidence from site 108 is less well-defined. The sunken featured building is dated as 'Saxon' and the small area investigated tells us little about the nature of activity or the relationship between the two sites. At least two sunken featured buildings (site 409) lie roughly seven hundred and fifty metres from the settlement site at Orton Longueville (site 411) and are the only other examples of such a

close spatial relationship. Unfortunately insufficient information exists to discern the character of the sunken featured buildings at site 409 but their location is significant in the context of the area where a number of sites lie in close association. Whilst it is not possible to assess the character of each site the pattern that begins to emerge is comparable with that observed in the area of Mucking.

Two finds of sunken featured buildings also lie close to sites identified from pottery scatters. In the St. Neots area a possible sunken featured building (site 518) was discovered less than three hundred metres from where Anglo-Saxon finds were recorded during an excavation in the 1990s (site 519). Neither site is well dated, with both described only as 'Anglo-Saxon', though site 519 is stratigraphically earlier than the Late Saxon activity recorded at the same site. The quality of the data from this area is insufficient to base an interpretation on, however elsewhere in the county this relationship between sunken featured buildings and pottery scatters is better defined. At Waterbeach an Early Anglo-Saxon sunken featured building was discovered by Lethbridge at the Car Dyke (Lethbridge 1927) (site 591) and the SMR states that he discovered two more close by (Lethbridge and Tebbutt 1932). These lay at one end of a twelve hundred metre long spread of sites known from surface finds of pottery and associated material (sites 592, 594 and 595). Site 592 lay six hundred metres south of site 591 and was represented by an extensive (0.2 hectares) scatter of Anglo-Saxon pottery and associated finds of animal bone and burnt stone (site 592) that was recorded by the Fenland Project (Hall 1996). The second pottery scatter (site 594) was found less than eight hundred metres south of the sunken featured building (site 591) and a scatter of

Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon finds was again recorded by the Fenland Project just over eleven hundred metres to the south of site 591 (site 595). This last site covered 0.4 hectares and appeared to be made up of individual areas of finds, probably resulting from plough damage to discrete features such as sunken featured buildings (Hall 1996). Whilst the data from Waterbeach is very fragmentary and of varying quality in terms of dates, the fact that it forms such a discrete area of activity makes it likely that it represents a settlement, comparable in size with Mucking.

Almost one quarter of sites known from surface finds lie within five hundred metres of another site of similar type. At Peakirk two surface scatters of Anglo-Saxon pot sherds lie two hundred metres apart (sites 431 and 432), to the north of Castor two more scatters of pottery (sites 568 and 569) are also closely related as are two similar finds, located close to Cambridge (sites 68 and 86), though none of these is securely dated to the Early Anglo-Saxon period. Finally three surface scatters of pottery (and in one case associated material culture) appear within seven hundred metres of each other in the Waterbeach area (sites 592, 594 and 595), which has already been discussed above. With the exception of Waterbeach the lack of contextual evidence and other closely related finds, along with poor dating make it impossible to say anything more about these sites except that their close spatial relationships may be significant.

In several cases sites lie further apart but may still form part of a single site or activity area, the best evidence for which comes from Buckden, to the west of Godmanchester, where two finds of sunken featured buildings lie twelve hundred metres apart (sites 40

and 41). Site 41 is a single Early Anglo-Saxon sunken featured building, located within a later Saxon site (Beresford and Hirst 1971). No contemporary features were recorded elsewhere in this site suggesting that this feature must have been relatively isolated. An unknown number of features described as Saxon 'pit huts' (SMR Cambs) (site 40) lie twelve hundred metres north and may represent the main focus of settlement. Elsewhere the evidence is far more tentative, the site at Hinxton Quarry, known from a relatively extensive excavation conducted during the 1990s, is just over one kilometre from a scatter of Anglo-Saxon pottery recorded at Duxford (site 155) but the latter is poorly dated and lacks any record of depositional context. A finds scatter (site 113) is also known less than twelve hundred metres from the fifth century activity site at the Castor Palatium (site 101) but is represented by only a single sherd of Anglo-Saxon pottery from a larger assemblage of material. The evidence from Great Willbraham is also inconclusive, with a group of Early Anglo-Saxon sunken featured buildings (site 267) lying roughly twelve hundred metres east of a scatter of hand-made Anglo-Saxon pottery sherds (site 274).

Some evidence for sites representing ancillary or off-site activity can be discerned from the relative frequency of certain types of finds. Of the fourteen sites known from sunken featured building finds, nine contained only one structure and in several cases the evidence suggests that these lay in relative isolation. The sunken featured building at Cottenham (site 132) was found during the excavation of a Middle Saxon site and, as no other contemporary features were discovered, it appears to have been situated on its own. Similarly, at Buckden, (site 41) a sunken featured building was found within a later

Saxon site with no associated finds or features. In some cases groups of features may also indicate off-site or ancillary activity. The group of seven sunken featured buildings discovered at Pampisford (site 425) appear to form a discrete cluster with no other Early Anglo-Saxon finds discovered within the excavation area whilst at Foxton (site 680) two sunken featured buildings were discovered within a Roman enclosure but with no other contemporary structures in the immediate area.

The second trend noticed in the spatial distribution was that large numbers of sites lay between one and a half and two kilometres apart, which may represent the average site density. Within the south east of the county this spacing between sites appears to hold true, the settlements at Hinxton Quarry (site 307) and Hinxton Hall park (305 and 308) lie roughly two kilometres apart along the same river and the same situation is observed at Linton (sites 339 and 341). Along the Cam the settlement at Harston (site 290/291) is less than two and a half kilometres from the sunken featured buildings found at Foxton (site 680), which is, in turn, three kilometres from a single sunken featured building at Barrington (site 20). Given how under-representative the known settlements are the fact that this two to three kilometre distribution remains constant within this part of the county could suggest that this characteristic of the localised pattern of settlement. This pattern breaks down in other areas of the county, however, with a far more widespread distribution observed along the River Ouse. By contrast areas along the Nene show a much higher site density, particularly at Orton Longueville where six sites are found within three and a half kilometres. Sites 411 and 412 may form part of the same settlement, though the whole area may not have been occupied at the same time and at

least two Early Anglo-Saxon sunken featured buildings (site 409) were recovered seven hundred and fifty metres east of site 411, representing either associated off-site activity or a further settlement. Just over one kilometre south of site 409 is Orton Hall Farm, where fifth and sixth century settlement features were found at a Roman settlement (Mackreth 1996) and over one kilometre east of site 406 are two other finds of settlement features. The most northerly (site 465), is known from finds of post-holes and other features and was occupied from the middle of the sixth century to the eighth century whilst one and a half kilometres south is the second settlement (site 442), where the features are described as 'semi-pile dwellings' (possibly sunken featured buildings). Whether this pattern should be regarded as the norm or whether such densely occupied areas are a local characteristic is difficult to determine. The area of Orton Longueville has been heavily developed, both for aggregate extraction and housing, and this may be responsible for the high site recovery. But the evenly spaced settlement pattern observed in the south east of the county does suggest that this is also a reflection of Early Anglo-Saxon activity, and that the differences exhibited in the distribution of settlement sites within these two areas at least, are the product of localised variation in the past as well as differences in site recovery in the present. The pattern of settlement in the fens and the Fen edge may also reflect differences in past settlement activity as both these areas were intensively surveyed during the Fenland Project resulting in the recovery of a number of Early Anglo-Saxon sites. Whilst it may be true that such sites are difficult to detect by field survey numerous Early Anglo-Saxon settlements have been discovered by such methods in other areas of the county (e.g. Lane 1988; Newman 1992).

3.4.4 Conclusions

A general theme running throughout this section is that the poor quality of the available data makes detailed interpretation problematic. What is clear is that, at its most general, the pattern of distribution observed in Cambridgeshire matches that of other areas in south east England, with settlement found largely along the routes of the major rivers and avoiding the higher ground and heavier soils. But this is a generalisation, and obscures a more complex picture. One site does lie on the higher ground, at Western Colville (site 604) where Early Anglo-Saxon pottery was found and similar finds were made in north west Essex (Williamson 1986). Site density is far from even, with distinct patterns characterising the Nene/Welland valleys, the lower Cam/Rhee, the Fenlands and the River Ouse. This may be the product of chance and the differential recovery of sites and it is certainly tempting to extend the evidence from Orton Longueville to other areas of the county but the evenly spaced distribution apparent in the south east of the county and the fact that the fens and Fen edge were intensively surveyed would suggest otherwise.

A case has been made for the existence of off-site or ancillary activity areas. Although this can not be demonstrated by anything other than large scale survey and excavation a number of factors have suggested that some of the sites examined may not represent large settlement sites. At Hinxton a post-built structure was found several hundred metres from the larger settlement, standing in relative isolation within a Late Roman field system and similar finds of single, and even groups of, sunken featured buildings also suggest that these structures lay apart from a larger settlement area. One interesting relationship observed during this analysis was the number of sites occurring within either existing field systems (such as Foxton, Hinxton, Pampisford and, perhaps Littleport and

Whittlesey) or later settlements (such as Cottenham and Buckden). This pattern illustrates the dynamic nature of the settlement landscape, with the character of an area or space constantly changing. In the case of Buckden and Cottenham this pattern is more enlightening, as both may represent off-site activity in the Early Anglo-Saxon period that becomes the main focus for settlement over the following centuries.

3.5 Funerary sites: overview

3.5.1 Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries

Funerary evidence dominates the material culture assemblage for the Early Anglo-Saxon period and is often used to indicate both the movement of people and the distribution of their settlements. This apparent strength in the overall assemblage may hide an inherent weakness as cemeteries are seldom looked for in the same way as settlements, through intensive field survey. A notable exception is the field survey of the Suffolk Sandlings, where areas have been both intensively field-walked and metal-detected (Newman 1992) but for most parts of the country any discussion of the distribution and density of funerary sites is reliant on chance discoveries and as such will reflect, not only the cultural activities of the past but also of the present. Generally speaking the evidence from other areas of the country shows that cemeteries occupy similar positions in the landscape as settlements, as they are often situated along the course of the rivers and river tributaries, though more often than not favouring slightly higher or more prominent positions (e.g. Suffolk see figures 49 and 50 the relationship between settlements and cemeteries is explored in detail in the following section). In many areas a relatively dense pattern of funerary sites can be observed with sites located between two and four

kilometres apart though in some cases cemeteries lie much closer to together, whilst still forming spatially discrete areas of burial. At Mucking the two cemeteries are roughly four hundred metres apart (Jones, 1980) (figure 49), lying on either side of the settlement. A similar situation can be observed at Beckford, Herefordshire where two Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries lay roughly five hundred and fifty metres apart, (Evison and Hill 1996) (figure 50). The cemeteries at West Stow may also have been located in close proximity to each other, though the sites were discovered during gravel extraction and were never excavated under archaeological conditions (West 1985).

3.5.2 Cemetery morphology

The number of known cemeteries for this period is too great to be able to adequately characterise the variations in size and layout so the following discussion will deal with general trends and observations from across the country. The size of funerary sites, both in terms of the number of individuals and the area utilised for burial varies considerably from individual burials, small funerary sites with ten or so burials to the massive cremation cemeteries such as Spong Hill, (Suffolk), where over two and half thousand individuals were buried (Hills 1987). The nature of the discovery of many sites has meant that considerable areas of a cemetery have often been destroyed, largely without any record of the number of individuals or the extent of the site. Not surprisingly the physical size of the cemetery is proportional to the number of individuals interred within it with a cemetery of one hundred burials covering an area between two and a half and three thousand square metres (figure 51).

A number of sites exhibit considerable variation in the spatial distribution of graves, with clusters or concentrations of burials contrasting with areas of little or no funerary activity. At Berinsfield (Oxfordshire) several distinct groups of burials can be observed with substantial areas within the site having no apparent archaeological features (Boyle et al. 1994) (figure 52). Two single burials lay at the extreme northern edge of the site, over twenty metres from the main focus of burial and, whilst further burials may lie beyond the limit of the excavation, these would still create a spatially discrete burial group at the edge of the cemetery. Similarly, the burials at Springfield Lyons, (Essex) appear to have been arranged in two clusters (Tyler 1996) (figure 53), with a less dense pattern of burial between them and several concentrations of cremations can be observed at Spong Hill (figure 54). Other sites show a more evenly distributed grave assemblage though still with some evidence for variation of the internal structure. At St. Peters, Broadstairs (Kent) the graves in the northwest of the cemetery are more closely arranged than those located elsewhere on the site and appear to have been aligned in rows, a pattern that is also evident at Buckland (Dover) (Evison 1987) (figure 55). Variation in the distribution of graves may represent the development of the cemetery. At Berinsfield, for example, new areas were brought into use for burial at the same time as existing areas of burial were being maintained (Boyle et al. 1996).

There are a number of cases where individual burials have been found without any other associated funerary activity though it is not immediately clear whether this is an aspect of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary ritual or the product of fragmentary excavation and the nature of chance discovery. As with the interpretation of settlement sites, many

cemeteries exhibit a degree of variation in their internal morphology, characterised by changes in the density of burials that may lead to misrepresentation when examined by only partial excavation.

Though this discussion has focused on too few sites to constitute a survey, a number of very general points can be made. The overall distribution of cemeteries in the south and east of England is comparable with that of the contemporary settlements, with sites occupying low lying land often along the course of rivers. However, both the overall distribution of cemeteries and the internal arrangement of individual graves show considerable variation. Areas of funerary activity that are interpreted as separate cemeteries can lie in close association, in some cases only a few hundred metres apart. Similarly, within many cemeteries burials appear to form discrete clusters or groups lying up to twenty metres from the next closest grave. These two points are important for the interpretation of funerary sites particularly when determining the possible size and extent of cemeteries from often fragmentary discoveries and when assessing whether finds represent a single site or several, closely related funerary areas. Furthermore, the clustering of burials within a cemetery may be a similar phenomena to the clustering of cemetery sites within the landscape, with each being the product of similar cultural practices. In the light of this we should also consider how we define a cemetery in physical terms, particularly when two sites may lie in close association.

3.6 Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites in Cambridgeshire

3.6.1 General distributions

The greatest number of group burials are found along the line of the River Cam/Rhee, the distribution of which appears to fall into two clusters, one centred on Barrington and the other on Cambridge (figure 56). The density of sites in these areas is relatively high with sites lying between one and two and a half kilometres apart though there is no evidence for any one site that might be acting as a focal point. Instead the pattern is generally a linear one, with most of the sites running along the line of the Cam/Rhee or along tributaries running from the east. In the east of the county a smaller number of sites are found with a more dispersed distribution. In some cases sites appear to form pairs, between two and four kilometres apart, though a slightly larger cluster of sites is known at Linton in the south east of the county and the group burial at Pampisford appears to stand in isolation. In the west of the county the number of sites falls dramatically, with only two on the course of the lower Ouse at St. Neots (sites 517 and 521) and one, further to the east at Gamlingay (site 226). Within the fens there are a small number of group burials, forming a widely spaced (between two and a half and four and a half kilometres) grouping, for the most part, close to the river Ouse though one site, at Chatteris (site 677), lies deeper within the fens, over ten kilometres from the nearest site. In the north west of the county a larger number of group burials are known, many of which form a linear arrangement, with sites spaced between five hundred metres and two kilometres apart along the line of the Nene to the south of Peterborough. A smaller number of sites are found to the north and follow a more dispersed pattern with burial sites lying in relative isolation.

Single burials make up a far smaller proportion of the total number of burial sites and, as such, it is harder to discern any pattern in their distribution. Generally speaking these sites follow a similar pattern to that of the group burials, with the majority lying in the same areas. Some sites show a close spatial relationship with group burials. Along the Nene three of the five single burials (sites 3, 4 and 433) are located in roughly the same area as the larger burial sites with a similar pattern observed around Cambridge. Single burials are also known close to the cemeteries at Barrington (site 15) and Foxton (site 223), on the southern Cam and at Linton (site 340). Other sites are found in relative isolation, with two single burials in the fens (sites 497 and 541) each over three and a half kilometres from the closest funerary site. The only area where single burials are the only known funerary site occurs around Godmanchester where two single or fragmentary burials (sites 237 and 321) located to the east of the Roman town. Unlike the group burials there is no evidence for single burials forming small clusters or groups, though this may be due to the small number of sites.

3.6.2 *Spatial analysis*

As with the analysis of the settlement sites the fragmentary nature of much of the data makes it difficult to determine whether every find represents a distinct cemetery or whether some form part of the same area of funerary ritual. Furthermore, as was already discussed, there appears to be two types of funerary site, those where there is only evidence for an individual burial or cremation and those where two or more individuals have been interred. It is, however, unclear as to whether these represent real differences in burial practice or whether the single burials are fragments of larger group burials.

The purpose of this section, therefore, is to examine the spatial relationships between funerary sites in order to observe any trends in their distribution that may help to answer these questions and which may help to understand the overall pattern of cemeteries in the landscape.

3.6.2.1 Group burials

The spatial relationship of group burials shows two distinct trends, with over one quarter of group burials lying within five hundred metres of the next closest burial site and almost one fifth lying between two and a half and three kilometres away (figure 57). This pattern varies across the county. Along the river Cam/Rhee, group burials are generally closer, with almost forty percent found within five hundred metres of another group burial (figure 58). Far more sites lie between one and one and a half kilometres away (just less than fifteen and a half percent) though there is still a second peak at two and a half kilometres with almost a quarter of sites. Along the river Nene just over forty five percent of all group burial sites lie within five hundred metres of another (figure 59). Once again, the second peak, is at two and a half kilometres, though in this case it is much reduced (less than twenty percent).

This pattern is broadly similar to that observed amongst the settlement sites with some group burials lying close enough to at least one other to form part of the same site. Others lie further apart, though many are concentrated at roughly the same distance, and may represent areas of intensive funerary activity.

Just over fifteen percent of group burials lie within five hundred metres of a single burial, a peak that is accentuated by the small number (three percent) that lie within five hundred metres and one kilometre (figure 60). This suggests some sort of relationship between the two types of site though it remains unclear as to whether this means that single burials are fragments of larger sites or that they form outlying or satellite burials. However the low number of single burials that are found within five hundred metres of each other may point to the latter.

3.6.2.2 Single burials

The low number of single burials and their widespread distribution makes any analysis of the spatial relationship difficult though the following general trends can be observed. Within the county as a whole only two sites (less than seven percent) lie within five hundred metres of another single burial and none lie between five hundred metres and one kilometre apart (figure 61). Along the Cam the distribution of single burials is roughly comparable with two sites within five hundred metres, two between one kilometre and one and a half kilometres and two between three and three and a half kilometres (figure 62). In the area of the Nene valley the pattern is different as no single burials are found closer than one and a half kilometres to another with forty percent lying between one and a half and two kilometres away from another single burial (figure 63).

3.6.3 Analysis of funerary sites

3.6.3.1 Group burials

Analysis of the spatial relationships between sites shows two main trends; firstly, that group burials often lie within five hundred metres of another group burial site and

secondly, that a large number also lie between two and two and a half kilometres of another group burial. Whilst many of these sites lie in close spatial association, what remains to be seen is whether they form part of the same cemetery (as defined as a distinct area of burial), or whether small, discrete clusters of group burials lie within the immediate vicinity of each other. Within the dataset seventeen group burials are located within five hundred metres of another group burial site; five lie along the route of the Cam (two at Barrington and three to the west of Cambridge at Newnham), four along the Nene, two at Eye, two at Linton, two at Oakington and two at Cherry Hinton, four kilometres east of Cambridge.

The two Barrington sites (sites 16 and 19) lie less than two hundred and fifty metres apart and are both recorded as being part of the Edix Hill Hole or Barrington A cemetery (Meaney 1964 p.60). Site 19 was first discovered in the middle of the 19th century with a number of records of finds by labourers between 1840 and 1860 including the discovery of around 11 graves (Babington 1860; Meaney 1964 p.60; Malim 1990). As a result of this the site was investigated in 1861 when around thirty inhumations were recorded (Fox 1923 p.250). Site 16, which lies to the north east of the area investigated in the nineteenth century, was excavated by the Field Archaeology Unit of Cambridgeshire County Council between 1987 and 1992 following the discovery of a number of sixth century objects by a local metal detectorist (Malim 1990). A total of one hundred and fourteen graves containing one hundred and forty eight individuals were recorded during these excavations (Malim and Hines 1998). The excavators believe that this site and the nineteenth century site are part of a single cemetery covering no more than half a hectare

(Malim 1990). A further group burial site is known at Hoopers field (Meaney's Barrington B) over a kilometre away (Foster 1880; Meaney 1964 p.60).

The three sites to the west of Cambridge (sites 54, 55 and 92) all lie within one hundred metres of each other. Site 54 (Barton Road) is known only from stray finds, including a number of spearheads found in 1893, several furnished inhumations recovered after 1938 (fox 1923 p.244) and cremation urns (SMR Cambs). Site 92 (Croft Lodge) is also known only from stray or accidental finds of two furnished inhumations. Both these sites were interpreted as belonging to a single cemetery site at Newnham by Meaney (Meaney 1964 p.68). The third site, site 55, (Newnham College) was discovered in the 1970s and appears to be more extensive. Two more sites are known at Oakington (sites 400 and 401). The first discoveries (Site 400) were made following the deep ploughing of a field when three furnished inhumations discovered (Meaney 1964 p69). Excavations within the same area in 1993 then led to the discovery of twenty three inhumations (Site 401) (Taylor et al. 1997). These sites would appear to be part of the same cemetery. The two Cherry Hinton sites lie less than three hundred metres apart. Site 52 is poorly dated, described in the SMR as furnished inhumations associated with 'Romano-English' pottery. (SMR Cambs). Site 53 was discovered in 1949 during controlled excavation and at least eight inhumations were recorded, cut into a Bronze Age barrow (Meaney 1964 p.63). Interpreting the relationships between these sites is very difficult given the small amount of information relating to site 52. However, no mention is made of site 53 extending beyond the barrow so it may be regarded as a separate funerary site. The two sites at Linton (sites 342 and 343) lie within five hundred metres of each other, though

the exact location of either site is unknown. Site 342 was discovered accidentally in 1936 during the construction of a cellar when two furnished inhumations were disturbed and in the previous year two cremations were discovered during work on a gas pipe (site 343). These sites have been interpreted by Meaney as belonging to a single cemetery (Linton A) (Meaney 1964 p.67), though no excavation has been carried out and this interpretation is based only on the stray finds of group burials and a single furnished inhumation (site 340) found close by (Meaney 1964 p.67).

Two more pairs of group burials lie close to or along the line of the River Nene in the vicinity of Peterborough. Sites 407 and 453 are located within the parish of Orton Longueville; a number of inhumations furnished with weapons were discovered during the second world war (site 407) just under five hundred metres to the south west of another group burial (site 453). This was known from a number of discoveries of metalwork and inhumations made since the late nineteenth century, which were followed by a controlled excavation in 1920 that recovered fourteen furnished inhumations. (RCHM Peterborough; SMR Peterborough). The second pair of sites occurs at Woodston, Peterborough, where an extensive mixed cemetery (site 450) lies less than two hundred metres from an area from which cremation urns and metal objects have been discovered since the nineteenth century (site 668) (SMR Peterborough).

Finally two group burial sites (sites 195 and 196) are known at Eye in the north east of the county. Site 195 was discovered in 1900 when two furnished inhumations were recorded and further records describe the discovery of inhumations at this site in the

nineteenth century (Meaney 1964 p.189). Recent archaeological work has failed to discover any more burials at the site, which appears to have been completely destroyed (SMR Peterborough). Site 196 lies less than three hundred metres to the south east where a single furnished inhumation was recovered from this site in 1970 and further records exist relating to the discovery of urns and grave goods at the same time (SMR Peterborough) The fact that site 195 has been evaluated and no trace of further burials recorded would suggest that these sites form separate areas of burials, distinct from each other.

Only at Barrington A and Oakington is there clear evidence that the two group burial sites belong to the same cemetery whilst only at Cherry Hinton and Eye can we imply that the two group burials form separate cemeteries. It is, however, clear that in many cases the discovery of an extensive cemetery has been preceded by more fragmentary discoveries, for example, numerous stray finds were recorded at Girton before two excavations uncovered over one hundred and thirty cremations and eighty inhumations and Fox excavated three inhumations at Foxton after reports of burials at the same site in the previous year (Fox 1924; Meaney 1964 p.65). This makes it likely that some of these closely related finds may form part of the same cemetery.

The second trend observed in the spatial analysis was a second peak in cemetery numbers, between two and two and a half kilometres from another group burial, which may suggest an average density of group burial sites. The situation is, however, more complex than this with a high degree of local variation in site density and distribution. In

some areas funerary sites form small clusters, such as at Orton Longueville, where at least four sites lie within fifteen hundred metres, at Cambridge with at least five cemeteries within two kilometres and, possibly, at Barrington where two large group burials lie within thirteen hundred metres. Within the same general areas, however, site density drops off with cemeteries located several kilometres apart. Unlike the pattern exhibited by settlements group burials show no constant or uniform pattern of distribution and exhibit a far broader site density, either because of differences in their recovery, a greater representation within the dataset as a whole or because of differences in the cultural practices that they represent. The two main concentrations of funerary sites, at Orton Longueville and Cambridge, both lie within areas that have been extensively developed, either by housing or aggregate extraction whilst the areas of lower site density are found in less developed, rural regions. However, localised variation in site density has already been shown to be a characteristic of the settlement landscape and so we should be cautious of extending the pattern observed around Cambridge and Peterborough to the rest of the county. Furthermore many settlements lie in close association with burial sites and, in some cases such as along the lower cam, the density of settlements is comparable with that of the cemeteries. This would suggest that the differences in cemetery distributions are, in some cases, a reflection of activity in the past as well as being the product of recent cultural practices.

3.6.3.2 Single burials

Interpreting the finds of single burials is hampered by the same problems as were previously encountered with larger burial sites. That is, do the finds represent larger, as

yet undiscovered burial areas or was the placement of individual graves away from other areas of mortuary activity a feature of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary practice? As the spatial analysis showed, a number of the single burials are found close to a group burial site, which might suggest that they were part of a larger burial group. Three sites lie within one hundred metres of a group burial; at Linton (site 340) a single inhumation furnished with a spear was found in 1934 and lies close to the two group burials (sites 342 and 343) whilst at Newnham, Cambridge, two single burials (sites 85 and 94) lie close to the group burial at Barton Road (site 54). The Linton burial has been interpreted as belonging to a larger cemetery (Meaney's Linton A) (Meaney 1964 p.67) though, as with the Newnham sites, these finds are all very fragmentary making it almost impossible to determine whether or not they represent separate burials, distinct from the larger cemetery. Only two other sites lie within five hundred metres of a group burial. Site 15, a furnished inhumation, was found roughly one hundred and seventy metres from the cemetery at Barrington excavated by the Field Archaeology Unit (site 16) (Malim and Hines 1998; SMR Cambs) and at Foxton (site 223) a single furnished inhumation was discovered in 1935 over two hundred metres from the small group burial discovered by Fox (Site 221) (Fox 1924; Meaney 1964 p.65). The exact location of the Barrington find may be called into question and it may belong to the known group burial. The Foxton burial does, however, appear to be distinct from the main area of burial and so may be considered as a separate, outlying, burial.

Of the remaining sites some have evidence to suggest that they are related to a larger group burial. Site 6, at Babraham, is a single furnished burial discovered around 1920

next to the Roman road (Worstead Street), where reports of inhumations on the opposite side of the road are also known (Meaney 1964 p.71). At Eye (site 199), a sixth century inhumation was excavated close to where Leeds is thought to have excavated a contemporary inhumation (SMR Peterborough). A single cremation urn was discovered in a gravel pit near Peterborough (site 433) and whilst no further funerary material was discovered several beads were recorded close by (SMR Peterborough). In a small number of cases, however, there is no evidence for any further funerary activity associated with the single burial. A fifth century crouched inhumation was discovered on Castle Hill in Cambridge (site 47) and single inhumations were also found at Horseheath (during the construction of a service trench) and Hinxton (site 683) (close to the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement site). In all three cases the finds were made during excavation which recovered no further evidence for mortuary activity.

The small number of single burials within the database and the variation displayed in their spatial distribution makes any detailed analysis difficult. In general a number of single burials are found close enough to group burials to suggest that they are part of the same site or are found with further objects suggesting that other burials lie close by. In three cases however single burials are found within areas where no other funerary material was observed suggesting that these burials were distinct from larger funerary sites.

3.6.4 Conclusions

It has already been shown that many group burials lie in close spatial association, though only in a limited number of cases can we determine whether these formed part of the



same site or whether several cemeteries lay close together. The evidence from elsewhere in the country shows that substantial cemeteries may lie within several hundred metres of each other whilst remaining spatially discrete, with the cemeteries at Mucking, for example being only four hundred metres apart. It has also been shown that the internal structure of a cemetery is often characterised by discrete areas of burials lying, in some cases, up to twenty metres apart, exhibiting, on a smaller scale, this pattern of cemetery distribution. Given that cemeteries are the product of several centuries of cultural activity these patterns should come as no surprise. An individual would be interred, either close to existing burials, perhaps of the same family, or as the focus for funerary activity shifted they may have been interred separately becoming the focus for later burial. As settlements, and people, moved within the landscape, new burials might have been established slightly further away and people may have begun to use two, closely related cemeteries. This would also explain the variation in cemetery distribution, as this would relate to the pattern of settlement and the extent of settlement mobility within any particular area.

The case for single burials representing a distinct cultural phenomenon rather than the partial discovery of a larger site may be inferred, though only in a limited number of cases. Even where single burials are found close to group burials they may still have formed separate areas of a larger funerary site. As we have already seen, group burials themselves exhibit spatial structuring both internally and between sites and there is no reason to imagine that this would not extend to the burial of an individual in a spatially discrete area close to a larger burial site.

3.7 Interpreting metalwork finds

Whilst finds of metal objects make up a significant proportion of the data for the fifth and sixth centuries their interpretation is frustrated by a lack of detail surrounding the depositional context of the finds. The presence of such finds is often regarded as indicative of funerary activity; surveys conducted for the Sutton Hoo project in Suffolk, for example, identified numerous scatters of metal objects that were interpreted as cemetery sites (Newman 1992 p.33), and the case for such interpretations has some justification. Certain types of metal objects, such as brooches and weaponry, are more common in cemeteries than they are in settlement sites (figure 64), and the discovery of such finds through non-archaeological means (such as metal-detecting) has preceded further discovery of human remains through archaeological excavation at a number of sites. During the Barrington excavations (Malim and Hines 1998) an area of the site was surveyed by metal detector and then sampled by excavation. Unfortunately the area surveyed was found to be devoid of both graves and metalwork, though graves were discovered in areas where metal objects are reported to have come from. At Easington (Co. Durham) (Hamerow 1995b) five graves were discovered within an area of the site where metal objects had previously been recovered and at West Hendred, (Oxfordshire) (Hamerow 1993b), six graves were recorded following excavations adjacent to where metalwork finds had been made.

However, whilst large numbers of metal objects are found as grave goods some are also recovered from settlement sites. The Early Anglo-Saxon settlements at Eye Kettleby

(Leicestershire), Mucking (Essex), West Stow (Suffolk), West Heslerton (North Yorks) and Sutton Courtenay (Berkshire) all contained metalwork finds of a type that are found in a funerary context. Typically these are recovered from the deposits within sunken featured buildings, but at West Stow four came from the buried land surface (West 1985 p.60) and at Mucking one was recovered from the enclosure ditch (Hamerow 1993a p.61). Metalwork finds are associated with distinct features at West Heslerton where small pits were recorded beneath three of the post built structures, containing 'unusual assemblages' that included broken girdle hangers (Powlesland 1996 p.47) (figure 65). At Eye Kettleby, five of the six Early Anglo-Saxon brooches were recovered from the spoil heaps following the removal of the topsoil (Finn forthcoming), suggesting that these finds had already been redeposited into the plough zone by recent agricultural practices, increasing the potential for their recovery by metal detecting. Interestingly the only stratified brooch from the site came from a small bog or marsh adjacent to the settlement area (Finn forthcoming). Metalwork finds are also found in contexts with no directly attributable function such as the fifth century brooch recovered from the ruins of a Roman building at Billingsgate, London (Vince 1990 p.7). Such finds are often regarded as accidental losses (e.g. Howe 1984), or as the deliberate discard of broken objects as waste but we should be cautious of accepting such simplistic interpretations without considering other possibilities. Five of the six brooches from West Stow were complete (West 1985 p.60) as were many of those from Mucking (Hamerow 1993a) and so are unlikely to have been discarded.

Whilst a clear relationship between metal objects and funerary activity does exist we should remain cautious of inferring the presence of a burial site from scatters of unstratified metalwork, as similar finds are known from settlement contexts. We should also be open to the possibility that certain objects may have been deposited as part of ritual activity, particularly as ritual hoarding of material is well known throughout Northern Europe in the Pre Roman and Roman Iron age (e.g. Hedeager 1992). The deposition of coin hoards as votive deposits has also been demonstrated within a Romano British context (Millett 1994) showing that such practices are known in Britain as late as the fourth century and the deposition of metalwork is clearly a deliberate activity at West Heslerton.

3.8 Early Anglo-Saxon metalwork finds in Cambridgeshire

3.8.1 General distributions in the county

The distribution of metalwork finds follows a similar pattern to that observed for the other types of site, with large numbers located along the rivers Nene and Welland, and along the Cam/Rhee south of Cambridge with a more sparse pattern in the east of the county (figure 66). Fewer finds are known in the Fens or along the Ouse whilst the south west of the county is characterised by an almost total lack of such finds. The densities of these finds shows a great deal of local variation with several distinct clusters clearly observed around the area of Peterborough where three finds are located within five hundred metres (sites 459, 460 and 461), Cambridge where four sites are found within four hundred metres (site 65, 71, 74 and 93) and Willbraham where three sites are located

within one hundred and fifty metres (sites 265, 270 and 271). In many cases, however, finds are located more discretely, either in pairs or as isolated finds.

Some metalwork finds lie close to or in the area of funerary sites, a pattern that can be demonstrated most clearly along the river Cam and, in particular, around Cambridge as well as Soham and Peterborough. Metalwork finds are also found in the same general area as settlement sites, though without the close relationship exhibited with the funerary sites. The general impression that this provides is that metalwork finds are located within areas of both settlement and burial activity, though in several cases single finds of metalwork lie in apparent isolation, between two and four kilometres from the closest site.

3.8.2 Spatial analysis

As was discussed earlier the lack of any contextual information in association with stray finds of metalwork makes their interpretation problematic. For this reason the spatial analysis was particularly important as a method of identifying any pattern in the relationships between metalwork finds and other types of archaeological site.

Just over one quarter of all metalwork finds are located within five hundred metres of another and over one third lie within one and a half kilometres of another metalwork find (figure 67). This suggests a close spatial relationship between many stray finds of metal objects. This pattern varies considerably over the county with half of all finds located within five hundred metres of another along the River Cam with no other discernable

peak in the distribution (figure 68), whilst along the Rivers Nene and Welland only one quarter are found within five hundred metres of a site of the same type (figure 69).

Metalwork finds are closely related to funerary sites, over half lie within two and a half kilometres of a burial site with almost one fifth of the total number located within five hundred metres (figure 70). In general terms this pattern is matched with the relationship settlements as over two thirds of metalwork finds lie within two and a half kilometres of a settlements site (figure 71). However, far fewer finds are located in the immediate vicinity, with just over ten percent found within five hundred metres of a settlement site.

3.8.3 Analysis of metalwork finds

Almost 27% of metalwork finds lie within five hundred metres of another metalwork site suggesting a close relationship. In two cases finds are reported from the same location, in Haslingfield (sites 297 and 298) and Stanground (site 441 and 448). The accuracy of the grid references for the Haslingfield finds is very poor making it difficult to determine their exact place of origin. The Stanground finds are, however, accurately located with a single brooch (site 441) discovered by a metal detectorist at a site where seventh century metalwork (part of a cauldron and a pan) was discovered in the 1960s (site 448) (SMR Peterborough). The Stanground finds lies over three kilometres east of the extensive cemetery complex at Woodston and a similar distance from any settlement related sites.

In several cases metalwork finds form discrete clusters. To the south of Cambridge five finds from four locations (sites 65, 71, 74 and 93) all lie between one and two hundred metres apart, forming a cluster of sites less than four hundred metres in length. All the

finds are brooches, though only the two recovered from site 65 are securely dated as Early Anglo-Saxon. Numerous sites lie close to this scatter, a single cremation urn was discovered almost three hundred metres to the south (site 90) and fragments of Early Anglo-Saxon decorated pottery were recorded close by at Trinity Hall (site 91). Early Anglo-Saxon pottery was also discovered immediately to the west at Sydney Street (site 88) and poorly dated Anglo-Saxon pottery was found at a separate location close to this site (site 57). Further metalwork finds (spear heads and a shield boss) are known from Rose Crescent (site 63) but the exact location of this site is not known. Fox interpreted this cluster of sites as forming an extensive cemetery and/or an area of sepulchral activity that would have been at least six hundred metres in length, with the main focus of burial at Rose Crescent (Fox 1923 p.245-7).

Less intensive concentrations of finds can be observed elsewhere in the county. Along the river Nene two brooches were discovered within one hundred and fifty metres of each other in the area of Peterborough (sites 459 and 460) and a finger ring was discovered roughly three hundred metres to the north (site 461). The location of the later find is doubtful as it was discovered in the river and none of these sites is securely dated to the Early Anglo-Saxon period making interpretation problematic. However an Anglo-Saxon glass bead (site 458) was also found in the same area, close to site 459 and all the finds all lie within one kilometre of the northern extent of the Woodston cemetery complex (site 668). The Early Anglo-Saxon settlement site near Orton Longueville, Peterborough (site 465) lies to the north placing the finds within an area of relatively intense settlement and funerary activity. Another small group of finds is known from Great Willbraham,

(sites 265, 270 and 271) in the east of the county. There two poorly dated finds, an Anglo-Saxon strap (site 270) and a spearhead of similar date (site 271) were discovered roughly five hundred metres apart and seven hundred and fifty metres to the north of where an Early Anglo-Saxon equal armed brooch was discovered (site 265) by metal detecting. The finder also discovered Roman pottery including Samian and ceramics dating between the first to the fourth centuries as well as fragments of bone from the same area (presumably whilst digging for the brooch) (SMR Cambs). The finds are clearly too far apart to represent a single site and probably represents an area of more intensive metal detector activity. However, these finds do not lie in isolation, with the possible sunken featured building at Willbraham (site 267), one and a half kilometres to the north and the extensive cemetery site at Little Willbraham (site 356), almost two kilometres to the north east.

Two finds are also known in close association at Haughton (site 316 and 317), just over three and a half kilometres east of Godmanchester, where an Anglo-Saxon spearhead was found in 1982 (site 316). This site lies less than two hundred metres from where an Early Anglo-Saxon brooch (sixth or seventh century) was discovered (site 317) (SMR Cambs). These finds are close enough to represent a single site, though determining its nature or function is difficult. Early Anglo-Saxon decorated pottery has been discovered one and a half kilometres to the south east at Great Hemmingford (site 258) and a cremation urn was discovered two and a half kilometres to the west (site 321) but neither are close enough to suggest anything other than a spatial relationship with the metalwork finds. Finally, two metalwork finds are known at Cheveley in the east of the county (sites 123

and 124). A single Anglo-Saxon knife was discovered at site 124 less than five hundred metres south of where a pin and two rings of twisted wire were found (site 123) by metal detecting. Unfortunately both these finds are poorly dated and are only described as Anglo-Saxon. No sites lie in the immediate vicinity of these finds, the closest burial is the cemetery at Burwell (site 43), over five and a half kilometres west, whilst the closest settlement site is the possible sunken featured building at Wilbraham, (site 267) almost twelve kilometres east. The Cheveley finds are, however, close to the county border and further finds may lie closer to the east.

Both the spatial analysis and an examination of the overall pattern of distribution show that metalwork finds are often closely related to funerary sites. A brooch and a number of other metal objects (site 87) were found within one hundred metres of the group burial at Grange Road, Cambridge (site 62) (Walker 1912; Fox 1923 p.245; Meaney 1964 p.62). Early Anglo-Saxon metalwork was also found at Newnham Cross, Cambridge (site 81) within one hundred metres of the group burial at Barton Road (Fox 1923 p.244) and a brooch was found at Great Wilbraham (site 268) within one hundred metres of the large mixed cemetery at Little Wilbraham (site 356). An undated girdle hanger was discovered by a metal detectorist in 1990 at Little Downham (site 350) roughly two hundred metres from an area where inhumations have been reported during the nineteenth century and the 1930s (site 349) (Hall 1996) whilst at Soham an axe head (site 489) was found three hundred metres from an area where inhumations had been previously discovered (site 492) (SMR Cambs).

Other finds are located within the same general location as funerary sites. On the southern Cam, three finds (sites 13, 17 and 21), each roughly one kilometre apart, are located in a small cluster between the known burial sites at Barrington Hoopers Field, Edix Hill Hole and Foxton. Unfortunately none of the grid coordinates is particularly accurate and without being able to accurately locate the sites it is impossible to interpret their true relationship with both the burial area and each other. At Soham two further finds are also known; a spearhead was discovered in the 1960s, less than one kilometre west of the most extensive of the Soham cemeteries (site 492) and an Early Anglo-Saxon long brooch (site 490) was recovered roughly one kilometre north east of the smaller cemetery at Newmarket Road (site 495).

A number of metalwork finds are also known from settlement sites within the county. The best example comes from Hinxton where an Early Anglo-Saxon brooch was discovered within a sunken featured building (site 307) (SMR Cambs), matching similar finds from other settlement site such as Mucking and West Stow (see above). A brooch was also discovered at Great Willbraham (site 268) in the same area as a scatter of incised hand-made pottery (site 274) though it is possible that the pottery represents broken cinerary urns, and may be associated with the mixed cemetery at Little Willbraham (site 356) that lies just over one kilometre to the south. A silver pin was discovered during excavations at Castor (site 104), where a possible sunken featured building was discovered though as neither find is well dated it is impossible to draw any further conclusions.

Several finds also come from the immediate vicinity of a settlement. A number of sixth century metal objects (two brooches and a wrist clasp) (site 424) were discovered within one hundred metres of the settlement site at Pampisford (site 426), several fragments of a small-long brooch (site 141) were discovered roughly one hundred metres from a scatter of Roman and Anglo-Saxon pottery at Cottenham (site 146) and an Early Anglo-Saxon sword was dredged from the Car Dyke (site 585), roughly one hundred metres from the location of a scatter of Early Anglo-Saxon pottery (site 595). Given the nature of this discovery it is possible that the sword was deposited at another location and then redeposited, possibly during dredging works. However, a shield boss (site 593) was dredged from the Cam roughly four hundred metres from where the sword was discovered raising the possibility that these finds have been deliberately deposited in a water course, possibly as votive offerings. A single inhumation, furnished with weapons, is known from the same general area (site 312) but on the opposite side of the river from the Waterbeach settlement (595) and the sword (site 585). A similar find is known near Peterborough where a gold finger ring (site 460), dated to the Anglo-Saxon period was found in the river Nene, seven hundred and fifty metres away from an Early Anglo-Saxon settlement (site 465). Several more finds are known slightly further away from an area with settlement activity. A hanging bowl and helmet (site 99), dated as Anglo-Saxon, was discovered at Castor, roughly four hundred metres from a scatter of Anglo-Saxon pottery (site 100), and a brooch (site 74) lies within seven hundred metres of a scatter of pottery (site 68) to the north of the Roman town of Cambridge. In the north west of the county an brooch (site 600) is also known seven hundred and fifty metres north of a surface scatter

of Early Anglo-Saxon pottery (site 437) at Werrington, Peterborough but in both cases interpretation is hampered by a lack of detailed information and accurate dating.

In a small number of cases metalwork has been discovered in contexts that appear to be distinct from both funerary and settlement activity. At Wood Walton, Peterborough (site 444) an Early Anglo-Saxon brooch was recovered beneath the demolished wall of a Late Roman stone building (SMR Peterborough) with contemporary activity evident from finds of Early Anglo-Saxon pottery and ditches in the immediate area. In 1980 an Early Anglo-Saxon brooch was recovered during the excavation of a foundation trench in Wentworth(Howe 1984). Analysis of the find showed no evidence for textile remains or corrosion on the reverse side, which often characterises brooches deposited on a body during burial and no human remains or other cultural material was observed in the trench. Added to this are the three finds noted above that were recovered from rivers and water courses in the county. It is impossible to say whether these finds were found in the context within which they were deposited but the close spatial relationship between the sword and shield boss at Waterbeach might suggest that this is the case.

3.8.4 Conclusions

That metalwork objects are found from both settlement and cemetery sites can be demonstrated by numerous examples from across the country, but the question remains whether such finds can be said to be indicative of either a settlement or cemetery. Without further information regarding the context from which these finds came it is difficult to draw any conclusions as to their character and the nature of the activity that they might represent. Furthermore, whilst several apparent clusters of finds are present

these are likely to represent areas where metal-detectorists are more active rather than variations in the overall pattern of distribution. Metalwork finds clearly show a spatial relationship with funerary sites, with large numbers located close to known areas of burial and others lying slightly further away, though remaining in the same general area. As was mentioned earlier, recent excavations at Barrington (Edix Hill Hole) in areas where metal objects had been recovered, resulted in the excavation of a substantial cemetery showing a direct link between the two types of finds. This fails, however, to resolve the issue of whether all such finds have come from a burial deposit or whether they may have been deposited in the same area. Similarly it is difficult to interpret the apparent relationship between settlement sites and metalwork finds. The find from Hinxton, for example, is securely placed within the context of the settlement itself, but in many other cases it is unclear whether the finds come from a settlement context or not.

The issue is further hampered by the possibility that certain finds may have been deposited outside of either a settlement or a funerary context, though possibly in close association, as part of a votive ritual. The metalwork dredged from the Cam, Nene and the Car Dyke may have been deposited intentionally, possibly as votive offerings or as part of some other cultural activity. This would certainly find parallels with contemporary bog deposits in north west Europe as well as ritual deposition of metalwork during both the Roman period and the Iron Age in Britain. The brooch at Wood Walton (site 444) may also have been deliberately deposited rather than a casual loss, and may have been associated with the destruction or demolition of the Roman building. The square-headed brooch discovered at Wentworth (Howe 1984) may have been deposited outside of either

a funerary or settlement context, as no finds indicative of either activity were found in the area, raising the possibility that some of the other metalwork finds may have been deposited in a similar context (or lack of context). In some cases, however, the recovery of metalwork without any associated human remains may be explained by other reasons. The concentration of finds to the south of Cambridge would have been discovered in an urban context, and may already have been disturbed by earlier development within the town, resulting in the loss of the human remains. Furthermore human remains have not always been studied with the rigour that they are today, with a great deal of antiquarian research focusing on grave goods. Such finds are intrinsically valuable and will, therefore, have a higher tendency towards recovery than any associated human remains.

3.9 Summary of results

As was discussed earlier this chapter had two main aims. The first was to examine whether there were any differences in the types of activity represented by similar types of site. Despite the fragmentary nature of much of the data this aim has been achieved. In several cases it has been possible to show that smaller, less densely occupied areas of activity existed within the vicinity of a larger settlement site and probably represent areas of off-site activity. Whilst the majority of these were made up of sunken featured buildings (for example at Pampisford) there was also one post-built structure at Hinxton that appeared to serve an ancillary function away from the main focus of activity. The nature of this activity is difficult to determine, particularly as there has been no attempt made in this project to analyse differences in the deposition of material culture at these sites. But given the small size of these particular sites and their spatial relationships with

the larger settlement area it would be reasonable to assume that they performed some ancillary function, possibly on a seasonal basis.

Similarly the finds of single burials may represent an aspect of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary ritual that is distinct from the practice of interring the dead in communal cemeteries. The interpretation of metalwork finds was hampered by the lack of contextual information and yet it has been possible to show that such finds do not necessarily represent a funerary site. Metalwork finds are known from excavated Early Anglo-Saxon settlements, though in smaller numbers than from cemeteries. More importantly, however, it can be argued that metal objects were also intentionally deposited either on their own or in small assemblages, possibly as votive offerings. The finds of metal objects from the Car Dyke may belong to a tradition of deliberate deposition of artefacts, either for the purpose of display, to remove precious objects from circulation or as votive offerings.

The second aim of this chapter was to examine the spatial distribution of sites across the research area and to identify any evidence for variation in this pattern. This has also been achieved. The distribution of sites across the county clearly matches that observed in other areas of the country, with activity concentrated upon the major rivers and tributaries and with the majority of sites situated on low lying ground. The settlement pattern across the county displays clear evidence for the clustering of sites, with many lying closer together than the average distance. Furthermore, there is evidence for different patterns of settlement distribution with a greater density of occupation in the area of Peterborough

and a more dispersed pattern of land-use in the south of the county. Whilst this may be the result of differences in site recovery, the very even distribution of sites along the river Cam and the high site recovery rate along the river Nene suggests that this is an accurate reflection of the distribution of settlements.

The examination of the spatial arrangement of the group burial sites shows that many lie in close association. In a number of cases several sites probably formed a single cemetery but in many other cases it was possible to show that two or more distinct funerary areas lay within a few hundred metres of each other. Not surprisingly, stray finds of metal objects showed a tendency to lie close to known areas of funerary activity and, in many cases, probably represent areas of burial. However it is also possible that some of these finds were deposited on their own, possibly as part of the funerary ritual or for the reasons mentioned above.

With this initial analysis completed it is now possible to move to the next stage of the project and to begin a more detailed interpretation of the sites leading to an understanding of the landscape.




Figure 29: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon sites in East Anglia (after Scull 1992).




Figure 30: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon sites in the Suffolk Sandlings (after Newman 1992).




Figure 31: Plan of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at Mucking (after Hamerow 1993).



Figure 32: Plan of the Early Anglo-Saxon features at Orsett (after Tyler 1996).




Figure 33: Plan of the Anglian settlement at West Heslerton (after Powlesland 1996).




Figure 34: Length and breadth of excavated Early Anglo-Saxon post built structures. (after Clemence, in Powlesland, 1996)




Figure 35: Reconstruction of Grubenhauser or Sunken Featured Buildings from West Stow (after West 1985).




Figure 36: The phasing of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at Mucking (after Hamerow 1993).




Figure 37: The phasing of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement at West Stow (after West 1985).




Figure 38: Distribution of all Early Anglo-Saxon settlements in Cambridgeshire (numbers relate to the figure key).




Figure 38 A: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements along the river Nene (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 38 B: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements along the river Cam (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 39: Distances between Early Anglo-Saxon settlements




Figure 40: Distances between Early Anglo-Saxon sites known from settlement features.




Figure 41: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features to sites with just Sunken Featured Buildings.




Figure 42: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features to sites to pottery scatters.




Figure 43: Distances between Early Saxon sites known from settlement features in the Nene valley.




Figure 44: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features in the Nene valley to the nearest site with just sunken featured buildings.




Figure 45: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from settlement features in the Nene valley to the nearest pottery scatter.




Figure 46: Distances between Early Saxon sites known from sunken featured buildings.




Figure 47: Distances from Early Saxon sites known from sunken featured buildings to pottery scatters.




Figure 48: Distances between Early Saxon sites known from pottery scatters.




Figure 49: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Mucking (after Hamerow 1993).



Figure 50: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Beckford (A and B) (after Evison 1996).




Figure 51: Area of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in relation to the number of individuals interred.

Taken from the following cemeteries: Petersfinger, St. Peters, Broadstarirs, Snells Corner, Droxford, Springfield Lyons, Alton, Winnal 2, Portway, Abingdon, Berinsfield, Castledyke, Nassington, Charlton.




Figure 52: The Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Berinsfield (after Boyle et al 1995).



Figure 53: The Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Springfield Lyons (after Tyler 1996).




Figure 54: Part of the Early Anglo-Saxon cremation cemetery at Spong Hill (after Welch 1992).




Figure 55: The Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Buckland, phases 1 and 2 (top) and 3 to 7 (bottom) (after Evison 1987).




Figure 56: Distribution of all Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites in Cambridgeshire (numbers relate to the figure key).




Figure 56 A: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites along the river Nene (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 56B: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites along the river Cam (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 57: Distances between group burials




Figure 58: Distances between group burials along the river Cam.




Figure 59: Distances between group burials along the river Nene.




Figure 60: Distances between group burials and single burials.




Figure 61: Distances between single burials.




Figure 62: Distances between single burials along the river Cam.




Figure 63: Distances between single burials along the river Nene.




Figure 64: Comparison of the types of artefacts recovered from Early Anglo-Saxon sites (after Richards 1992).



Figure 65: Plan showing a foundation deposit beneath a post hole structure at West Heslerton (after Powlesland 1996).




Figure 66: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon metalwork finds. (above) (Numbers relate to the figure key).




Figure 66A: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon metalwork finds along the River Nene (numbers refer to site codes).




Figure 66B: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon metalwork finds along the River Cam (numbers refer to site codes).




Figure 67: Distances between metalwork finds.




Figure 68: Distances between metalwork finds along the river Cam.




Figure 69: Distances between metalwork finds along the river Nene.




Figure 70: Distance between metalwork finds and group burials.




Figure 71: Distance between metalwork finds and settlements.

4 *RE-CONSTRUCTING THE LANDSCAPE*

4.1 *Saxon settlement in the Late Roman landscape*

The overall pattern of settlement of the Early Anglo-Saxon period follows that of the preceding centuries with settlements concentrated on low-lying land close to the major rivers and tributaries (figure 72). Sites of both periods are well-represented on the south bank of the River Ouse, along the river Cam and close to smaller water courses in the east of the county. Neither period is well represented in the west, between Godmanchester and Sandy (Bedfordshire), or on the higher ground in and around the edges of the county. The main exception to the overall similarity occurs within the fens where the dense pattern of fourth century settlement is replaced by a small number of isolated sites, restricted to the Fen edge and occasional Fen islands.

This apparent uniformity in the distribution of settlements can be demonstrated more clearly by a closer examination of the spatial relationships between the sites (figure 73). A large number of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements lie on or close to sites occupied during the fourth century, with over forty percent located within 500m and over twenty seven percent occurring on the same site. The evidence for continuity is, however, more sparse with only five sites (8%) showing actual evidence for continued use from the fourth to the fifth century. Of these the most conclusive is the well known settlement at Orton Hall Farm (site 409), which lies south of the river Nene within an area of dense activity during both periods. The site was first occupied in the second century and developed into a small farmstead made up of several stone-built structures located around a courtyard. Early Anglo-Saxon material culture first appears within the latest phase of Roman activity and

the character of the site is maintained through the fifth century, with continued use of Late Roman structures and the courtyard. This pattern only changes in the final phase of the site, when structures move away from this area and the courtyard ceases to act as the focus for structural activity (Mackreth 1996 p.41). Just over 4km to the south east a Late Roman structure at Haddon, (site 282/3) also exhibits evidence for continuous activity. At this site a bath house went out of use in the later half of the fourth century, the floor removed and post-holes, possibly for roof supports, inserted into the base of the structure. Fifth and sixth century pottery was recovered from this site and the excavator has stated that there is evidence for unbroken activity from the Roman to the Early Anglo-Saxon period (SMR Peterborough), though clearly the character of this structure changed. Early fifth century activity is also known at the site of the Palatium at Castor, an extensive and undoubtedly important site during the Late Roman period. This vast complex of buildings covers an area 275m by 122m, one wing of which is estimated to have stood almost 20m high (Mackreth 1995 p.152) and sits within an area that had been artificially terraced. Dating is unclear but the site was probably established around AD300 and Mackreth has argued that the scale of the building, which has parallels with structures in London and on the continent, suggests that it was the residence of an individual of considerable status, possibly associated with central government. The evidence for fifth century activity is confined to one of the lower terraces where excavations have shown the continued use of Late Roman features and surfaces (SMR Peterborough) though no further activity is known elsewhere within the site.

Continuity has also been argued for the Roman town of Godmanchester where two excavations have resulted in the discovery of fifth and sixth century material and structures. At Granary Close (site 265/6) the site was extensively re-organised during the later fourth century, with the demolition of the *Mansio* and the rebuilding of the bath house. This continued in use until the end of the Roman period, by which time the site was enclosed and two timber structures constructed. Post-Roman activity is attested by fifth century pottery though this was largely unstratified. Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon (fifth century) pottery has been found at a second site within the town, (site 239) where part of a possible fenced enclosure was also reported (SMR Cambs) and Early Anglo-Saxon pottery has been recovered from several more locations within the town (Green 1975). Along the lower Cam limited evidence for site continuity is found at Foxton, where two sunken featured buildings were located within a fourth century ditched enclosure, part of which had been re-cut and contained both fourth and fifth century material. The nature of settlement activity for either period is inconclusive. A Roman post-built structure lies close to the Early Anglo-Saxon features but has been truncated by a later fourth century ditch, suggesting a reorganisation of activity in this area of the site prior to the establishment of the Anglo-Saxon buildings (Maynard et al. 1997). Activity may also have continued at Stonea Grange, Wimblington (sites 531 and 532) where fifth century structures have been discovered within the fourth century settlement (Jackson and Potter 1996). During the fourth century this site lay at the edge of a dense scatter of settlements, a pattern that changed in the fifth and sixth centuries with a dramatic reduction in site density and large scale abandonment of the sites occupied during the Roman period.

Whilst activity may have continued from the fourth to the fifth centuries at some sites in several cases a clear break can be observed between the activity of the two periods. At Orton Longueville (Site 406) the Roman settlement was abandoned in the early fourth century with Anglo-Saxon activity occurring immediately to the south during the sixth century. Evidence for a change in settlement activity also comes from Wood Walton (Site 444/5) where a Roman structure was demolished in the Early Anglo-Saxon period, the site was cleared and ditches cut along new alignments. Similarly settlement activity from the Early Anglo-Saxon period at Hinxton Hall (site 308), Pampisford (site 426) and Peterborough (site 465) have been found within Late Roman field systems but without any related settlement features of a Late fourth century date, suggesting a shift in the focus of settlement. Furthermore, many Early Anglo-Saxon settlements are located close to, but not on, the site of a fourth century settlement, suggesting a widespread, though localised, shift in the focus of settlement.

Early Anglo-Saxon activity both within and around a Roman town can only be demonstrated at Godmanchester, where a strong case can be made for continuous use of parts of the town (Green 1975). No contemporary settlements are known from the area around the town, a pattern that is matched by a lack of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites. At Durobrivae (Castor) a single sherd of Anglo-Saxon pottery found within the Roman suburb is the only evidence for post-Roman activity (SMR Peterborough) whilst the sunken featured building at Elmlea (site 108) constitutes the only Anglo-Saxon activity in the immediate area of the town. Similarly no Early Anglo-Saxon settlement activity is

known within the Roman town at Cambridge, and only three possible settlements are known close to the town (sites 51, 68, 86).

Whilst the general pattern of settlement for both periods is largely coincident over 38% of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements are located on new sites over two kilometres from the closest Late Roman settlement. Whilst this may be due to differences in site recovery the Early Anglo-Saxon settlements at Littleport (site 365) and Ely (site 186) both lie over two and a half kilometres from the closest fourth century site despite lying in areas surveyed by the Fenland Project. We may, therefore, suggest that the wider distances observed between sites of the two periods is a further characteristic of the relationship between the location of fourth century sites and those occupied in the fifth and sixth centuries.

Overall the pattern that arises is one of considerable variation. Several sites occupied in the fourth century have clearly continued in use well into the Early Anglo-Saxon period, whilst others show evidence for a break in use prior to reoccupation in the following centuries. Site abandonment is clearly a fate of the majority of fourth century settlements but with Early Anglo-Saxon occupation tending to occupy areas close by, often within a few hundred metres and occasionally within Roman field systems and enclosures. The number of sites located over two kilometres from a fourth century settlement is lower but has been shown to be a further characteristic of the overall relationships between Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements.

4.1.1 Explaining the change: current interpretations

Explanations for this confusing and apparently contradictory pattern generally treat the different aspects of the settlement pattern as separate phenomena; typically site continuity, site abandonment and settlement shift. Site continuity is generally regarded as atypical and explained as the occurrence of unusual circumstances relating to the survival of Romano-British institutions. Thus, the fifth century activity at Godmanchester is interpreted as a tax point manned by mercenaries (Green 1975 p.207) whilst the post-Roman occupation at Orton Hall Farm is due to the placement of *Foederati* by a surviving Roman administration (Mackreth 1996 p.238). Site abandonment and settlement shift are, however, regarded as symptomatic of the end of Roman Britain and explained by more generalised mechanisms relating to the Roman economy, the environment and the arrival of Germanic groups. The economic basis for site abandonment does find some support in the archaeological record as both the number and size of villa sites declines throughout the fourth century (Millett 1990 p.186), and there is a lack of evidence for late fourth century activity on a number of sites (Newman 1992 p.31). Environmental evidence for land use and animal husbandry, however, argues against such an interpretation with little indication of forest regeneration (e.g. Dark and Dark 1997) or of major changes in animal husbandry (e.g. Crabtree 1989) following the Roman period. Nor can a decline in population be supported by the lower number of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements as this has already been shown to be the product of factors relating to the recovery of archaeological sites.

Settlement shift is equally difficult to explain, environmental change has been suggested for a number of areas, such as West Heslerton (Powlesland pers comm), with settlement

moving due to changes in the level of the water table. Changes in agricultural practice and, in particular the intensification of land use may also explain the settlement shift. A number of researchers have demonstrated an intensification in agricultural practices during the fourth century resulting in the colonisation of more marginal land. Simon Esmonde-Cleary, for example, has argued convincingly that fourth century settlements patterns show an expansion onto the first terrace of the river Thames, an area that had previously been devoid of settlement activity (Esmonde-Cleary 1989 p.105). Any subsequent decrease in agricultural intensity may, therefore, result in the abandonment of such marginal areas and such localised changes in land use are unlikely to appear within the limited environmental data. Within Cambridgeshire, however, there is little evidence to support such an interpretation as, with the exception of the fens, settlements of both periods lie in similar areas and, in close association.

Site abandonment and settlement shift have also been explained within the context of a Germanic migration. Both West and Scull have argued that the coincidence of site location shows an overlap in occupation suggesting that the Germanic settlement took place within a landscape that was still largely inhabited (Scull 1992; West 1985).

4.1.2 Settlement mobility: An alternative explanation

The pattern of settlement observed in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries can, however, be explained as part of a single phenomena and be used to argue that settlement mobility is a feature of the landscape throughout much of the past.

Numerous Roman sites in Cambridgeshire show signs of changing use: in Foxton a settlement site becomes abandoned and incorporated into the field system before being used as a small cemetery (Maynard et al. 1997) whilst the site at Maxey was abandoned during the third century but re-occupied after a short period (Pryor 1985). Within the Fens a large number of sites were abandoned in the late third century (Hall and Coles 1994) and the settlement pattern around Peterborough is dynamic throughout the Roman period (Condron 1995) (figure 74).

Analysis of the fourth century sites in Cambridgeshire provides further indication of the dynamics of the settlement landscape. To begin with these settlements were being established throughout the Roman period (figure 75) and whilst this may give the impression that there is a gradual rise in site numbers we must remember that sites were being abandoned at the same time.

Furthermore, of those sites where the end of occupation can be accurately dated almost half had gone out of use by c.350AD proving that site abandonment is not confined to the later fourth and early fifth century (figure 76). Finally, of the two sites established in the fourth century whose end date can be accurately established, one had gone out of use by the middle of the century suggesting a life of less than fifty years (figure 77).

Within the context of settlement mobility the relationship between fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements becomes clearer. The apparent contradiction in settlement relationships where sites can exhibit either continuity of use, abandonment, later

reoccupation or settlement shift is a pattern that might be expected to occur at any given moment.

4.2 Settlements and cemeteries: the living and the dead

A direct relationship between a settlement and a funerary site is often inferred in the archaeology of the Early Anglo-Saxon period and the location of a cemetery is often used to suggest the presence of a nearby settlement. At Barrington, for example, the excavator states that the presence of several cemeteries in this area points to the presence of related settlements close by (Malim and Hines 1998). Some support for this approach comes from the close spatial relationships exhibited between such sites, for example at Mucking, where burials lie in the immediate vicinity of settlement features (Jones 1980; Hamerow 1993a) (figure 78), West Heslerton, where the cemetery lies several hundred metres north east of the main settlement site (Powlesland 1996) (figure 79) and Cassington and Eynsham, where a close spatial relationship between settlements and cemeteries can be observed at a number of sites (Hawkes 1986) (figure 80). Further evidence comes from the field-walking in the Suffolk Sandlings where metal-detector surveys have revealed metalwork finds concentrated close to inferred areas of settlement activity (Newman 1992), (though this is based on the assumption that all metalwork finds are indicative of funerary activity, which has already been questioned). Wider surveys of the available data generally support such an interpretation with settlements and cemetery sites occupying similar positions in the landscape (e.g. Suffolk. Scull 1992) (figure 29), North Shoebury (Essex) (Wymer and Brown 1995) (figure 81).

But we should treat such generalisations with some caution, as in East Yorkshire cemeteries are located within different parts of the landscape, some distance from the closest settlement (Lucy 1998) (figure 82). The complexity of the relationship between settlements and cemeteries can be seen at sites such as Mucking and West Stow where two cemeteries lie immediately adjacent to the settlement area. In these cases, if close spatial relationships relate to social relationships between sites, we must assume that two cemeteries in use at the same time were used for burial by a single settlement. Determining the social relationships between sites is further hampered by the differences in the recovery of settlement and funerary sites, with settlements being under-represented in the archaeological record. The pattern of settlement/cemetery relationships is, therefore, the product of recent activities and will show localised differences based on agricultural regimes and the impact of development.

Examining the spatial relationships between settlements and cemeteries within the research area shows considerable variation in the distance between such sites, with only 9.2% of settlements located within five hundred metres and 29.2% within one kilometre of an area of funerary activity (figures 83 and 84). The under-representation of the settlement sites and the wide distribution of the funerary sites makes it difficult to assess the significance of these results in terms of past social relations. In particular, it is difficult to determine whether such variation in the distances between such sites reflects aspects of the cultural landscape in the past or archaeological recovery in the present.

In some cases sites do appear to form pairs or small groups such as at Bedwell Hay Farm (sites 183 and 355), but these are only apparent due to the absence of further sites in the same area. Many more sites appear in apparent isolation, such as Burwell (site 43) which lies over 3.5km from the nearest contemporary site or Chatteris (site 677), which is over eight kilometres from any other Early Anglo-Saxon find. Closer examination of those settlements that lie close to known funerary sites does little to illuminate this issue. The settlement at Gamlingay (site 225) lies adjacent to a large burial site (site 226), but the cemetery was occupied from the sixth to the tenth centuries, considerably longer than the occupation at the settlement (SMR Cambs). The fifth century sunken featured building discovered at Grantchester (site 251) lies less than two hundred metres from where a number of knives and spearheads were discovered in the nineteenth century (site 250) (Meaney 1964 p.66), but the nature of either site is difficult to interpret due to the fragmentary nature of the finds and the lack of dates for the metalwork. Similarly, the possible sunken featured building and poorly dated Anglo-Saxon deposits at St. Neots (sites 518 and 519) lie only two hundred and seventy metres from an Early Anglo-Saxon cremation site (site 517), and two scatters of Anglo-Saxon pottery sherds discovered at Upton (sites 568 and 569) lie between five hundred and fifty metres and nine hundred metres from the small cremation site at Alwalton (site 5), but neither the nature, nor the date of the settlement activity is known.

The topographic or physical context of the sites does provide some further evidence; where settlements and cemeteries are found close together they tend to occupy similar topographic contexts and be at roughly the same height. The Linton Village cemetery

(site 340, 343) lies on the valley floor, at the same level as the two settlements and probably visible to both. Along the Cam, the Barrington cemeteries occupy ground above the twenty metre contour, on a shallow slope slightly higher than the sunken featured building (site 20) less than 700m to the south; the Foxton burials lie between the fifteen and twenty metre contours on a gentle north-facing slope, opposite the Barrington sites and only slightly higher than the sunken featured buildings that lie one kilometre to the south west; further north at Grantchester both the possible burial site (site 250) and the sunken featured building (site 251) lie on a flat plateau, formed by the fifteen metre contour. Elsewhere in the county the same relationships can be observed. At Little Thetford, (Bedwell Hay Farm) a possible settlement (site 355) and a cemetery (site 183) both lie on top of a low hill just above the fifteen metre contour and to the south of Peterborough the settlements appear to be located slightly higher than the cemeteries, on the same north-facing slope of the Nene valley. This may suggest a relationship between certain sites, but not necessarily in terms of a settlement and the cemetery that served it, as the location of an existing cemetery may have influenced the siting of a new, and unrelated, settlement and vice versa. In other cases, however, cemeteries are located in different topographic settings to the closest settlement. The cemetery at Great Willbraham (site 356) lies on a prominent position, just over the thirty metre contour at the top of a relatively steep slope at the western end of a wide, irregular valley. The site overlooks the nearby settlement site (site 267) that lies below the fifteen metre contour on gently sloping land on the valley floor. It should be noted, however, that three metalwork finds (sites 265, 270 and 271), which may indicate further funerary activity are known to the south of the settlement and occupy a similar position in the landscape.

A combination of often fragmentary data, the difficulties of interpreting finds in terms of on or off-site activity and the certainty that large numbers of sites have either been destroyed without trace or await discovery makes it almost impossible to infer a direct relationship between any single settlement and a closely related cemetery. In one area, however, the modern day landscape and the context of archaeological discovery provides us with a better understanding of these issues. The Early Anglo-Saxon settlement near Peterborough (site 465) lies less than four hundred metres from the extensive mixed cemetery at New Fletton (site 668), which was in use during the same period. Close by, a possible Early Anglo-Saxon settlement (site 442) lies roughly four hundred metres from where a cremation urn was discovered during gravel extraction (site 433). However, this pattern is not matched within the surrounding area as four settlement sites lie just to the west at Orton Longueville (sites 406, 409, 411 and 412), between eight hundred metres and one and a half kilometres from the closest cemetery. The vast majority of this area has been developed, either for aggregate extraction or housing and given the relatively high density of settlements in this area it would be surprising if associated burial sites had not also been identified. As this is not the case it may be reasonable to suggest that the apparent variation in the distance between settlements and cemeteries is a reflection of the Early Anglo-Saxon landscape in this particular instance.

With this in mind we can begin to move away from site specific examples and look, instead, at the general pattern of settlement and cemetery location. As we have just seen along the river Nene, where the density of sites of both types is highest a clear pattern

emerges with settlements and cemeteries clearly occupying separate zones and with the distances between them varying. These sites are not all contemporary, and the dating for several of the settlements is uncertain, but those that are securely dated are not significantly closer to the burial sites than those that are not. Indeed the settlement at Orton Hall Farm (site 406) is the furthest away from a burial site whilst being the earliest settlement in the area. In the previous section the settlements in this area were interpreted as being the product of a mobile, shifting pattern of land use where settlements and off sites activity areas went in and out of use, a pattern that characterises the landscape through much of the past. We have, therefore, an area of settlement activity, constantly changing, but which remains spatially distinct from the area of burials and funerary practice. Furthermore, the same pattern can be observed in the fourth century. Roman burials (sites 446 and 455) lie within the centre of the area that was later used for Early Anglo-Saxon funerary practices whilst Late Roman settlements are located to the south and west, the same area as the Early Anglo-Saxon settlements.

This level of segregation between cemeteries and settlements may be paralleled at Hinxton where two Early Anglo-Saxon sites lie along the course of the Granta (sites 305 and 307) with a third possible site at Duxford (site 155), just over one kilometre to the west. No burials are known in the immediate area, which is surprising given the higher proportion of funerary sites within the dataset. The closest burials lie outside the county, at Great Chesterford (Essex), where an extensive Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery was discovered close to the Roman town (Evison 1994) with other, more fragmentary finds, suggesting the presence of further funerary sites (SMR Essex). Whilst it is dangerous to

infer the absence of past activity on the basis of an absence of data the area around Hinxton has been extensively exploited for aggregate extraction and subjected to archaeological investigations. Therefore the fact that there is no evidence for any funerary sites within the area of the Hinxton settlements may be significant and it is possible that funerary activity avoided the settlement area and was focused instead on the Roman town and fort just over 2km south of the most southern Hinxton site. This may also be the case at Cambridge, where a large concentration of cemeteries is clearly visible, but with no closely related settlements, suggesting that this was an area of burial distinct from that of settlement.

This pattern is not, however, matched in other parts of the county. At Linton a cemetery (site 343) is located almost exactly between two settlements (sites 339 and 341), with further burials (site 337) located to the north west, on higher ground along the sides of the valley and, as we have already seen, settlements and funerary sites along the river Cam occupy similar areas, though the cemeteries might be sited on slightly higher ground. Whilst we can not relate specific settlements to any particular burial site the pattern suggests that areas local to the settlement were used for burial and vice versa, creating, over time, a pattern of settlement that is intermixed with the distribution of cemeteries.

There is, therefore, some evidence for variation in the relationship between settlement and burial across the county, though this evidence is fragmentary and does not cover a large number of sites. Why this difference should exist is not entirely clear. It may relate

to differences in settlement density with more dispersed settlement favouring closely related burial sites or to variations in local custom.

4.3 Cemeteries in the landscape

4.3.1 The physical landscape

Whilst some variation is exhibited in the topographic context of a cemetery site almost half (41.7%) lie on flat ground (though this analysis will have failed to account for small scale nuances in the physical landscape) (figure 85). The remaining sites do, however, exhibit a range of topographic settings. The most common site location after flat ground is on sloping ground (27.8%) though away from any noticeable break of slope. A slightly smaller number (22%) are situated on the top of a slope whilst only 8.4% have been placed at the base. This range of locations shows no clear geographic pattern, sites situated on the face of a slope are found in the same area as those on either the base or the top of a hill. Nor is there any clear relationship between the type of funerary practices and the location of the cemetery in the landscape, which contrasts with similar studies from other parts of the country (e.g. Lucy 1998). Inhumation cemeteries are found in all types of location and whilst cremations are not found on sloping ground this may be due to the small number of such sites within the dataset. Similarly, although mixed cemeteries are not found at the base of slopes few sites of any type are situated in such a location.

Looking at sites in greater detail increases the degree of variation. In some cases sites appear to have been placed so as to either over look or be visible from certain areas. At Great Willbraham the large cemetery site (site 356) is situated at the top of a west-facing

slope, (above the thirty metre contour), roughly at the end of the valley over-looking the possible settlement site (site 267), which lies over one kilometre to the west on the fifteen metre contour. The cemetery would have commanded a view along the valley, looking towards the west, and the steep valley sides but would have been obscured by the rising slope to the east. The three metalwork finds (sites 265, 270 and 271) all lie on a large area of flat ground, above the fifteen metre contour and over one and a half kilometres south of the settlement, an area that would have been visible from the main cemetery. At Linton a single burial (site 22) is also located on a slope at the end of a valley, though in this case the topography of the area means that this site would only have been visible well within the narrow valley. Finally at Cherry Hinton a small inhumation cemetery (site 53) was focused around a prehistoric barrow close to the top of an western facing slope, just above the forty five metre contour. The site would not have been visible from the east but would have looked towards the Roman town and the associated cemetery sites. A second burial site (site 52) lies close by at the top of the south facing slope of the same hill and would have commanded a different view.

In other cases prominent positions have been avoided with the site located on lower, more obscured areas. The Soham churchyard site (site 487) for example, lies just above the five metre contour avoiding a small hillock (ten metres above sea level) six hundred metres to the north. The area to the north and west of Soham is very flat, varying between zero and five metres above sea level and this alternative location would have been very prominent. Similarly the Oakington cemetery (sites 400 and 401) lies in the centre of a low lying area, avoiding a low hill less than one kilometre to the north west (the most

prominent position in the immediate area) whilst the Foxton cemeteries (site 221) lie on a shallow slope within considerably higher ground just to the south.

The choice of either a prominent or relatively obscure site location cannot be related to settlement location in any general manner. At Barrington and Grantchester the cemeteries lie slightly higher than the nearby settlements though on a very shallow sloping ground. At Great Wilbraham the burials are located on the top of a steep slope, overlooking a possible settlement site one kilometre to the west and at Linton burials are located both on the valley floor, between the settlements, and higher up, on the steep sloping valley sides. However, as settlement sites are under-represented in the dataset no detailed comparison of their effect on the topographic location of a cemetery is possible.

4.3.2 Cemeteries in the historic landscape: Reuse of monuments and sites

Relationships between Early Anglo-Saxon burials and existing features of the cultural landscape can be divided into three categories or groups; burials re-using or focusing upon earthwork features such as barrows, burials with a close relationship to sites occupied during the fourth century, and Early Anglo-Saxon burials within Late Roman cemeteries (figure 86).

Over 16.5% of the Early Anglo-Saxon burials (a total of ten sites) were situated on or close to prehistoric monuments, of which half were located close to a barrow (figure 87). The remainder were cut into linear earthworks (20%), ring ditches (20%) or located within an earlier enclosure (10%). There is no evidence to suggest that cemeteries of a particular size have a greater association with such features. The cemetery at Linton (site

337), is made up of over one hundred burials, whilst at Cherry Hinton (site 53) around eight inhumations were discovered. Inhumation is the most common form of burial in cemeteries associated with prehistoric monuments accounting for eight out of the eleven sites and with two having both inhumations and cremations and only one with just cremations. Of those sites that could be dated accurately three started in the fifth century with the majority, (four sites) established during the sixth century suggesting a gradual increase in this practice overtime.

The topographic setting of such sites shows only a slightly different pattern to that observed for other funerary sites, with one third located on flat ground, one third on the face of a slope and the final third at the top of a slope (figure 88). As with other funerary sites, closer examination of the specific physical context shows a great deal of variation. The only site that is located in a position to make it prominent over a wide area is the burial site at Cherry Hinton (site 53) which commands a view to the north west across Cambridge, whilst the site at Linton (337), lies on the side of a steep valley which, though prominent to the local area, would have had a limited field of view. Only two sites associated with a prehistoric earthwork lie close to contemporary settlement and both lie on the southern Cam (at Foxton (site 221) and Barrington (site 19)). As has already been discussed these cemeteries lie on relatively flat ground close to areas of possible settlement activity. Neither is located in a particularly prominent place, though both are slightly higher than the nearby settlements. In both cases these cemeteries have incorporated Iron Age features (a ring ditch at Barrington and an enclosure at Foxton), though it is unclear whether either would have been visible at the time when the cemetery

was in use. The cremations cut into the ploughed-out barrow at Orton Longueville (site 416) is the next closest site to settlement features and lies on flat ground, down slope from the nearby settlements.

In four cases Early Anglo-Saxon burials are found in areas of Roman funerary activity, accounting for less than 7% of the total number of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites examined. Of these the best evidence comes from Girton (site 227), near Cambridge, where an extensive mixed cemetery, dating from the fifth to the sixth centuries was discovered in the nineteenth century. Within the same area numerous Roman burials were discovered including several cremations (Meaney 1964 p.65) and later inhumations interred in coffins whilst structural remains may indicate the presence of a temple at the site. The Early Anglo-Saxon activity is generally considered to be intrusive, with Roman activity ending some time before the earliest Anglo-Saxon graves and with the later features disturbing some of the Roman burials. Roman burials were also found at the St. Johns College cemetery (site 62), to the north west of the Roman town at Cambridge (Fox 1923 p.242-4). The date of the Roman activity is unknown, as is the full extent of the site but Saxon activity is thought to begin in the middle of the fifth century, slightly earlier than the Girton cemetery. A possible Roman cremation was discovered at the site of the Haslingfield cemetery (site 295) (Meaney 1964 p.66), which lies over six kilometres south of Cambridge and just to the north of the Barrington cemeteries. The site was largely destroyed by coprolite digging in the nineteenth century, though objects and human remains were sold on to antiquarians. Both cremations and inhumations were found and the site appears to have been in use during the fifth and sixth centuries. The

fourth site lies further to the east, at Swaffham Prior (site 546), where three sixth century inhumations were discovered along with six burials that have been interpreted as Roman.

The general relationship between Early Anglo-Saxon and Late Roman cemeteries is difficult to gauge, due to the small number of Roman burial sites known to have been in use during the fourth century. However, of those Late Roman sites that are known, over half lie within one and a half kilometres of an Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery and 64.6% lie within two and a half kilometres. This is comparable with the Early Anglo-Saxon settlements where 40% are found within one and a half kilometres of an Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery and 61.5% are found within two and a half kilometres. In several cases burials of both periods lie close to each other such as at Alwalton (site 5), where the Early Anglo-Saxon cremation cemetery is less than seven hundred metres from a Late Roman burial (site 570) and at Peterborough, where a fourth century burial ground (sites 455 and 446) lies within the extensive complex of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. This association is likely to be greater if we suggest the presence of Roman cemeteries outside the town of Cambridge but, as we lack firm evidence for fourth century burial in this location this can be no more than conjecture.

The relationships between Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and fourth century settlements shows a remarkably clear distribution with almost one third of the total number of cemeteries located between one kilometre and one and a half kilometres of a fourth century settlement (figures 89 and 90). Given that both these types of site are well represented in the dataset we might have expected a closer relationship. As it is, however,

only 7.8% of cemeteries lie within five hundred metres of a Late Roman settlement. There also appears to be a relationship between the type of funerary practice and the distance from a Roman settlement. Of the seven sites that lie within five hundred metres of a fourth century settlement three are cremations and one is mixed, and cremation sites are also well represented in those cemeteries between five hundred metres and one kilometre from a Roman settlement. Furthermore the only cremations found further than two and a half kilometres from a Roman settlement all come from the St Neots area and may represent either a variation in local practice or, more likely, the fact that this area is under-represented in the archaeological record for this period.

In addition several fourth century sites appear to act as the focus for Early Anglo-Saxon funerary activity. This is most pronounced at Cambridge where twenty four separate finds of funerary material and nine finds spots of metalwork lie within a five kilometre radius of the Roman town (figures 91 and 92). The density of funerary sites shows a sharp decline with distance from the Roman town, though this may be due to the impact of recent urban activity on the recovery of archaeological material. It is, however, clear that no other single location provides such a focus for funerary activity. However, similarities can be observed at other locations outside of the county. Though not on the same scale, funerary activity is also focused around the Roman town at Great Chesterford, where one extensive Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery and several more fragmentary finds have been made (SMR Essex). Fifth and sixth century burials are also known at the Roman town at Sandy, where the burials lie within the fourth century cemetery (Dawson 1995).

4.4 Conclusions

We have seen how the archaeology of the later Roman period differs from that of the Early Anglo-Saxon period and how this has affected the recovery patterns of certain types of site. But this difference has another meaning; by the middle of the fifth century, if our chronologies are to be trusted, an enormous number of sites of certain types had disappeared. More specifically, no buildings were constructed of stone, large scale industrial sites had ceased to exist and, most importantly, the settlement landscape displays no evidence for the same degree of social stratification that is exhibited in the preceding centuries.

Contemporary with this discontinuity in the material culture record is the continued pattern of settlement, within the same areas as the fourth century, sometimes on the same site with no discernable break in cultural activity, but often shifting onto new areas close by. This is a pattern that can be demonstrated during the preceding centuries, with sites going out of use whilst others continue and new sites are established. Areas of land which had been settlements became fields, whilst field systems reverted to settlements and, in some cases, cemeteries. It is confusing, yet true, that the evidence for continuity in the settlement landscape is characterised by its inherent discontinuity. Cemetery location in the Early Anglo-Saxon period also appears to have been influenced by the presence of fourth century settlements, with the former clearly avoiding the later. Yet Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries are generally located at a similar distance from both fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements. This may suggest that cultural practices associated with

the relationships between settlement and cemetery treated sites of both periods in the same way.

It is also clear that the within the Early Anglo-Saxon landscape there is considerable variation as seen in the pattern of settlement distribution and the relationship between funerary and settlement sites. Furthermore, the choice of cemetery location and the practice of reusing earlier monuments as the focus of burial differs greatly across comparatively small areas of the county. Whilst this is, in part, due to the factors affecting the recovery of sites it also illustrates the complexities of the landscape in terms of past cultural activity and serves as a warning against generalised statements concerning site location and relationships. Such variation may well reflect differences in cultural practices, which indicate the presence of localised groups or social entities that saw themselves as different from neighbouring settlements or areas within the bounds of the modern county.







Figure 72: Distribution of all fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlement sites in Cambridgeshire (numbers relate to the figure key)







Figure 73: Distances between Early Saxon settlements and settlements occupied in the fourth century.



A: First century



B: Second century



C: Third century



D: Fourth century

Figure 74: Roman settlement patterns along the Nene Valley (after Mackreth 1995).




Figure 75: Date of establishment of sites occupied in the fourth century.




Figure 76: Date of abandonment of sites occupied in the fourth century.




Figure 77: Date of abandonment of fourth century sites by date of establishment.




Figure 78: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Mucking (after Hamerow 1993).




Figure 79: Location of the Anglian cemetery at West Heslerton (after Powlesland forthcoming).




Figure 80: Location of the Early Anglo-Saxon sites at Cassington (after Hawkes 1986).




Figure 81: Early Anglo-Saxon sites at North Shoebury, Essex (after Wymer and Brown 1995)




Figure 82: Location of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and settlements in East Yorkshire (after Lucy 1998).




Figure 83: Distances from settlement sites to the nearest funerary site.




Figure 84: Distribution of all Early Anglo-Saxon settlement and funerary sites in Cambridgeshire (numbers relate to the figure key).




Figure 84 A: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements and funerary sites along the river Nene (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 84 B: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlement and funerary sites along the river Cam (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 85: Topographic context of funerary sites.




Figure 86: Instances of re-use of earlier monuments by Early Anglo-Saxon burials.




Figure 87: Dates of Early Anglo-Saxon burials re-using earlier monuments.




Figure 88: The topographic context of Early Anglo-Saxon burials re-using earlier monuments and Roman cemeteries.




Figure 89: Graph showing distances from Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and settlements occupied in the fourth century.




Figure 90: Distribution of all Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites and fourth century settlements in Cambridgeshire (numbers relate to the figure key).




Figure 91 A: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites and fourth century settlements along the river Nene (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 91 B: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon funerary sites and fourth century settlements along the river Cam (numbers refer to the site codes).




Figure 91: Numbers of Early Anglo Saxon cemetery sites around the Roman town of Cambridge by area.




Figure 92: Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon burials around Cambridge.

5 DISCUSSION: THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

5.1 *The Roman to Saxon transition: continuity or change*

The archaeology of Early Anglo-Saxon England is defined largely by its relationship with the preceding, Roman period. The profound change in both the nature and deposition of material culture, apparent changes in the pattern of settlement and a shift from largely unfurnished inhumation to both furnished burial and cremation coupled with written sources testifying to the end of Roman Britain have created a framework within which fifth and sixth centuries are seen as something distinct from that of the third and fourth. But the extent to which this perception is the product of our historical framework remains to be assessed. As with any form of inquiry, archaeological investigation works within a conceptual framework through which the material culture record can be understood. The use of the terms Roman and Anglo-Saxon, for example, are meaningless without a system of classification and an historical model within which they can be understood. It is a mistake to equate this model with the written sources relating to the post-Roman period, as these are as much an aspect of the material culture record as a post-hole or pot sherd and require the same form of interpretation. Indeed, the attempt by some archaeologists to go beyond a 'traditional approach' by treating the period as proto-historic and working without the written sources has often resulted in work that differs little from the very approach that they attack. Chris Arnold, for example, whilst rejecting the 'monolithic structure' of the historical sources employs a terminology to describe different aspects of the material culture record is reliant upon our conceptual frameworks for it to have any meaning (Arnold 1984).

Whilst it is impossible to work outside of our established conceptual frameworks it is still possible to consider them in a critical manner, looking at the ways in which they can influence our interpretations of the data. More specifically, within the context of the settlement landscape we can assess the evidence for both continuity and change and determine the extent to which the perceived break that characterises the start of the Early Anglo-Saxon period can be verified by the archaeological evidence.

To begin with it is clear that any direct comparison of either the number or density of settlements is impossible due to the differences in the factors affecting the recovery of sites of both periods. The majority of Roman sites that we see in the dataset are what we might describe as archaeologically visible, due to the more robust material culture, differences in deposition of material, the types of features present and the use of stone, brick and/or tile for building. Early Anglo-Saxon settlements, by contrast, have a less robust material culture, a different pattern of deposition of such material and an absence of building materials. It has also been shown that the recovery of different types of site varies over both space and time and that the past two decades has witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements that have been recorded. This corresponds with an increase in the number of non-villa type Roman settlements, a type of site that suffers from a similar under-representation within the dataset (Hingley forthcoming). Therefore, the lower numbers of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements and their more dispersed distribution cannot be taken as evidence for either a decline in population following the fourth century, a collapse of the post-Roman landscape in terms of settlement and economy or for cultural discontinuity.

The idea of wide scale site abandonment as being a characteristic of the end of Roman Britain and the start of the Anglo-Saxon period can also be called into question. Many Early Anglo-Saxon settlements occupy areas that were in use during the fourth century with a small number displaying clear evidence for continued activity whilst others show a clear break, with the site abandoned and re-occupied later. Many more Early Anglo-Saxon sites lie close to, but not within, fourth century settlements, on *de novo* sites typically between five hundred and a thousand metres away though others lie further apart in areas with little or no known Late Roman activity. This confusing pattern of continuity, site abandonment and re-occupation and settlement shift is difficult to understand within established frameworks that perceive a break between the Roman and Saxon periods, particularly as those sites with clear evidence for continuity continue in use throughout the Early Anglo-Saxon period. However when viewed in relation to the Roman settlement landscape the issue becomes clearer. To begin with there is good evidence for a continuing pattern of settlement shift throughout the Roman period, particularly along the River Nene (e.g. Mackreth 1995; Condon 1995). Throughout the county certain areas show evidence for changing land use, such as Foxton in southern Cambridgeshire, where a second century stone building was demolished and the area incorporated into the field system (Maynard et al. 1997). A Late Roman cemetery was established within part of the enclosure system and fourth century structures and enclosures were established close by. Furthermore, widespread site abandonment was recorded during the Fenland survey for the third century with many areas being re-occupied in the fourth (Hall and Coles 1994). Whilst an environmental explanation may

fit the Fenland data, the evidence from many other areas shows that, throughout the Roman period, the pattern of settlement was constantly changing. Further examination of the Early Anglo-Saxon sites shows that this process continued. In several cases Early Anglo-Saxon settlement features were found within Roman field systems, for example at Hinxton and Pampisford, whilst in others the settlement features lay within later Saxon settlements. More interestingly many of these sites showed a lower density of features and often lay close to a contemporary settlement, raising the possibility that these may have been off-site or ancillary activity areas, largely peripheral to the main focus of settlement. We have, therefore, the same pattern of mobility within the Early Anglo-Saxon landscape that was observed for the Roman period; some fourth century field systems and enclosures change their function with the introduction of settlement features and areas of off-site activity later becoming the main focus of settlement. The relationship between fourth century and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements mentioned above, with the apparently contradictory pattern of continuity, abandonment and shift would be what we might expect were we to view the dynamic pattern of site mobility at any single point in time. If this is the case then the idea of a settlement shift, with the wide scale abandonment of Roman settlements being somehow characteristic of the Early Anglo-Saxon period can be called into doubt.

There is some evidence for cultural continuity in the landscape. To begin with Early Anglo-Saxon burials sites in the area of Peterborough form a distinct area or zone, separate from the nearby cluster of contemporary settlements. A similar pattern is observed in the fourth century, with a Roman cemetery lying within the cluster of Early

Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and with the Roman settlements tending to lie to the east, in the same area as those sites occupied in the following centuries (figure 93). Across the county the spatial relationship between fourth century settlements and Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries was remarkably coincident, with many fifth and sixth century burial sites lying within one kilometre of a fourth century settlement, a relationship that matched that between Early Anglo-Saxon settlements and cemeteries. Certain areas in the landscape also seem to have retained an importance; the Roman town of Cambridge forms the focus for a dense distribution of funerary sites, one of which, Cherry Hinton, lies on the side of a steep hill and commanded a view across the town. Furthermore, the cemetery at Girton, to the north west of Cambridge, lies within a Late Roman burial site and Roman burials were also recorded at St. Johns to the west of the town. Similar relationships between Roman towns and Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries are known from other parts of the country, for example at Great Chesterford (Essex) and Sandy (Bedfordshire) but are not apparent at every town within Cambridgeshire. There is, for example, little evidence for burial around the town of Godmanchester despite evidence for intra-mural activity in the fifth century and a similar lack of funerary activity characterises the landscape around Water Newton and Durobrivae. The continued use of towns such as Cambridge as an important place in the landscape may, therefore, be localised phenomena, though this may still reflect perceptions of the landscape during the fourth century. Finally there is limited evidence for a continuity in architectural form and/or building technology. The Late Roman post-built structure at Foxton is almost identical to the standard building type of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements. The structure is rectangular, with the walls bearing the weight of the roof, with shallow post-holes. Whilst its size is considerably

smaller than some Saxon buildings it still lies well within the known parameters of Early Anglo-Saxon building size (Powlesland 1996) (figure 94).

There is, however, considerable evidence for a break or discontinuity within the landscape from the fourth century to the Early Anglo-Saxon period. As has already been discussed there are a number of differences between Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon settlements; the former vary in scale considerably, utilise a greater range of building material and technologies and a difference in architectural style to the latter. Furthermore many sites in the fourth century landscape would have exhibited imposing displays of wealth and status, both on a personal level with Romanised farmsteads and villa complexes and on a regional or national/state level with towns, roads and palatial sites. By the fifth century such sites were no longer constructed and most probably lay in ruins, the limited activity within the town of Godmanchester and the Castor Palatium failing to even begin to reach the same level as that of the preceding centuries.

Reconciling the apparent continuity of settlement with the profound change in the nature of these sites is problematic. For the majority of the population, who did not live in towns or large villas, the pattern of settlements probably remained the same though the changes in architecture and building technologies may reflect a change in the ways in which status was displayed. But for the remainder of the population, the inhabitants of the villas (of varying scale), it is harder to determine their place in the post-Roman landscape. Higham has suggested that changes in the means of displaying status accounts for the abandonment of villa sites; status in the Roman period was displayed through exclusion,

with the social elite distancing themselves from the rest of the population whilst in the post Roman period status depended upon the size of your household, which required a greater integration of the different social ranks (Higham 1992 p.126). Higham's model is, however, based upon two assumptions; firstly that, in the south east of England, the fourth century aristocracy were largely replaced by a Germanic warrior elite and, secondly, that the known Saxon settlements were the dwellings of the social elite and that the bulk of the population lived in smaller, as yet unknown, sites. Whilst it is beyond the scope of this project to look in detail at issues such as Germanic invasions/elite-take over models or the nature of social display in either the Roman or Saxon periods it is possible to make a number of observations. To begin with, the discovery of the fourth century building at Foxton suggests that the architectural tradition of the Early Anglo-Saxon period may have its roots in the small, presumably low status, rural settlements of Roman Britain and would make unlikely homes for the new elite. Secondly, the continuity displayed in the pattern of settlement suggests that it is the descendants of the Roman population who inhabit these settlements rather than an incoming, migrant group. Furthermore, the limited evidence for cultural continuity as seen through the continued use of distinct areas for burial, the importance of centres such as Cambridge and the relationship between fourth century settlements and Saxon cemeteries adds further weight to the widespread continuity of much of the population. But whilst certain aspects of Higham's interpretation can be questioned, the idea that a major change took place in the ways in which status was displayed remains sound and can be clearly demonstrated by the fact that the lack of evidence for status display in the fifth and sixth century landscape

stands in stark contrast to the evidence from the Roman period. What remains unclear, however, is the reason for this change.

In general it has been shown that, in terms of the pattern of settlement and in some aspects of cultural practice, there is a high level of continuity from the Late Roman to the Early Anglo-Saxon period. The apparent break in settlement is largely the product of our own system of classification, whereby the Early Anglo-Saxon period is seen as distinct from the preceding Roman one, and of the differences in the recovery of archaeological sites. But what we see instead is not simply the survival of Roman settlements into the Anglo-Saxon period, but the continuity of a pattern of settlement that existed throughout the Roman period, and possibly earlier. There is, however, a major change in the landscape marked by an absence of display and a far more limited repertoire of architecture and technology, which is likely to reflect major social changes. The reasons for this change are, however, unclear; it may reflect wider economic changes associated with the end of Roman Britain and/or underlying conflict within the society of Roman Britain that manifested itself in the fifth century. The arrival of new groups (either from the continental mainland or from other parts of Britain) may also have provided a catalyst for change, either through the introduction of different social practices or by providing an environment within which change could occur. Whatever the reason, it is clear that an understanding of the Early Anglo-Saxon period can not simply relate to differences with the final decades of Roman Britain, but must be grounded in a sound understanding of both Roman and Anglo-Saxon archaeology.

5.2 Understanding the Anglo-Saxon Landscape

5.2.1 The Settlement landscape

The examination of those sites with settlement type characteristics has provided the opportunity to discuss the character of the settlement landscape in the fifth and sixth centuries, an aspect of the archaeology of the period that is, perhaps, less well studied than others. The small number of settlement sites and the variable quality of the available data as well as problems with the biases effecting the recovery of such sites made it difficult to discern anything more than generalised trends in the pattern of settlement and land use. Despite these problems a number of interesting trends have emerged.

The examination of the context of some of the sites had provided some evidence for off-site activity areas based upon the density of features and the extents of the excavation. In several cases either a single or small groups of sunken featured buildings or post-built structures lay within larger, more extensive sites. These cases exhibit a lower density of features than many larger settlements, even considering the variation in settlement morphology exhibited by the small number of largely excavated sites. Understanding the nature of such sites in terms of their relationship with the larger settlement area is difficult, particularly as they may have performed a variety of functions. It is possible that some of the activities conducted at such locations involved activities or depended upon resources that were not associated with the main settlement site. The post-built structure that lies peripheral to the main settlement at Hinxton, for example, may have been built to accommodate people working away from the settlement or for storage associated with agricultural activities. However, such functionalist interpretations may conceal more complex social practices requiring the exclusion of individuals, aspects of material

culture or animals from the main settlement area. These areas need not have been in use permanently. Sites may have been occupied seasonally in relation to agricultural time tables or social ritual and the nature of the activities may have also varied throughout their life.

The larger settlement sites and the more peripheral, smaller off-site activity areas are thinly distributed across much of the research area but in certain cases a denser pattern of activity has been noted. In the area to the south of Peterborough a dense pattern of settlement activity has been observed matching the observations from other parts of the country such as Mucking. It is, however, difficult to extend this pattern to the rest of the county, due to variation in the recovery of sites and the probability that settlement density would vary considerably across wide areas. Furthermore, the Peterborough sites include several whose dates are not well established and it is extremely unlikely that all sites were occupied at the same time. The evidence available for settlement in the south of the county, in the region of Barrington and Foxton on the lower Cam and Linton in the west shows a more dispersed pattern of settlement, with many sites lying between one and two kilometres apart. It is possible that this reflects an accurate picture of settlement density as much of this area has been exploited for aggregate extraction and been subjected to much archaeological investigation.

As has been discussed earlier in this section the settlement landscape is dynamic; settlement sites are often located within earlier field systems whilst areas of off-site activity became the focus for later settlements. But the extent to which this mobility was

an aspect of the landscape over short periods of time, becoming a part of the way in which people saw their world, is debatable. The degree to which settlement shift would have occurred during the Early Anglo-Saxon period is difficult to discern. Some sites are slightly later than others but there is little evidence for site abandonment and shift that characterises the landscape over longer periods of time. This might suggest that the movement of settlements between the fourth and fifth centuries stands out as something special, marking the end of Roman Britain and the start of the Early Anglo-Saxon period but, as has been discussed above, changes in land use occur throughout the Roman period. Instead site mobility should be regarded as a feature of the landscape over time whereas, in the short term, settlements remained largely static. The often stated assumption that settlement morphology is also dynamic, that within a settlement the focus of activity is constantly moving, may be challenged. The recent work on Anglo-Saxon sunken featured buildings has demonstrated the problems of dating a site using the material recovered from these features and may challenge the basis upon which sites such as Mucking have been phased (Tipper forthcoming). Though the focus of settlement at Mucking may have shifted from the south to the north of the site Hamerow's interpretation of the site as a 'wandering settlement', implying a constant movement of settlement features may be harder to substantiate (Hamerow 1993). The excavator of West Heslerton has argued that there, the site remains largely the same throughout much of its use, though it does contract in its final phases (Powlesland 1998). It is unlikely that every feature on a settlement site would have remained in use throughout its use, sunken featured buildings, for example, clearly go out of use during the life of the settlement and this may reflect localised shifts in the focus of activities. But whilst settlement sites may

have been relatively fixed over the short term, land use would have been constantly changing. It is likely that many of the off-site areas were occupied only at certain times, related to either agricultural time tables or to social practices and ceremonies. Certain areas of the landscape would have been in use seasonally, different activities, for example, would have taken place within the field systems and some resources will only have been available at certain times of the year.

Understanding why sites (or to be more precise why people) move is difficult. An environmental explanation finds little supporting evidence from within the research area with the exception of the Fenland areas in the north of the county. Elsewhere the extents of the shift are often far more localised and it is clear that in the same area some sites are abandoned whilst others either continue or are quickly re-occupied. The nature of the rural economy may be partly responsible, with a need to move to new areas of land to allow local resources to regenerate. The shifting pattern of settlement may also reflect attitudes to land ownership or to space and the landscape in general. A group may have defined its identity by moving, slowly, through an area, re-occupying the homes of their predecessors and reinforcing their links with the past whilst recreating the world in the present.

5.2.2 Funerary ritual and the landscape

5.2.2.1 Current trends

Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries have been the focus for intensive research over the past few decades as researchers have attempted to understand aspects of the social world of the living through their treatment of the dead. The attempt to equate social status through

the relative numbers and 'value' of grave goods (e.g. Arnold 1979) was largely unsuccessful and more recent approaches have concentrated upon social groupings such as age, gender and ethnicity. The relationship between certain types of grave goods and biological sex has long been known (e.g. Pader 1982), and these associations may have been part of a funerary ritual whereby gender relations were re-created (Lucy 1998). Current work has also shown that grave goods are associated with both age and gender and that during the course of an individual's life their gendered identity might change (Gowland 2000). Studies of the ethnic character of the cemetery population have also been conducted, notably by Harke who has argued that burial with weapons was a symbol of an Anglo-Saxon identity (Harke 1991). The basis for this work has recently been challenged (Tyrell forthcoming) and others have argued that weapon burial is more a symbol of masculinity than of ethnic affiliation (Gilchrist 1997).

In the past few years a number of researchers have adopted a landscape approach to funerary practices and have moved towards the analysis of the relationships between cemeteries and both contemporary settlements and earlier monuments. Sam Lucy has shown that Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in East Yorkshire occupy a different place in the landscape from the contemporary settlements suggesting that the dead were marginalized from the living society (Lucy 1998). The association of Early Anglo-Saxon burials and the cultural landscape has recently been examined by Howard Williams who has argued that the presence of ancient monuments was one of the most important factors in determining the location of an Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery (Williams 1999). This association between cultural features in the landscape and Early Anglo-Saxon burials is

interpreted by Williams as a means by which social groups ‘were constructing and reproducing their idealized versions of past and present, their mythical origins and their social identities...’ (Williams 1999 p.25).

5.2.2.2 *The living and the dead in Early Anglo-Saxon Cambridgeshire*

By examining the relationship between cemeteries and the cultural and physical context of the sites it has been possible to construct a broader view of funerary ritual and its place in the landscape. The location of cemeteries in relation to the physical landscape shows that a wide range of choices were available. Several sites lay in prominent locations, though often only visible from certain directions, whilst many avoided such locations and are sited on lower, less prominent, places. This does not appear to be related to the variation in the topography as a number of cemeteries are situated on low lying ground even where more prominent locations occur close by. Nor is it related to the reuse of prehistoric features as a third of such sites are located on flat ground. In some cases the topographic setting of the cemetery may have been determined by nearby settlements, or vice versa as several cemeteries, such as Barrington, Foxton and the possible site at Grantchester, lie on shallow slopes, only slightly higher than the nearby settlements. In other cases, however, the cemetery is located in a more dominant position, such as the cemetery at Great Wilbraham which is situated at the top of a steep slope, overlooking the settlement in the valley floor. This variation in the relationship between settlements and cemeteries was observed across the county, though differences in the recovery of these sites may be partly responsible. In the north west of the county, to the south of Peterborough, cemeteries clearly occupied a separate area to the contemporary settlements with the sites forming two distinct clusters. Further to the south, however,

settlements and cemeteries are found in close association, such as along the lower Cam and at Linton.

Similar variation is displayed in the relationships between cemeteries and existing features of the cultural landscape. Overall the level of re-use of existing features in Anglo-Saxon burials represents a significant proportion of the total number of cemeteries, matching the results of a more detailed study carried out by Williams. However, as has already been discussed the nature of this activity varies from either the re-use or continued use of Late Roman cemeteries, the close association with fourth century settlements and the association with prehistoric monuments. The dates of the cemeteries that lie within Late Roman burial sites is generally early. Girton for example was first occupied in the middle of the fifth century, suggesting continued use rather than later re-use of an existing funerary area. Though the dates from those sites that are closely related with prehistoric monuments are often vague (the majority dated only as Early Anglo-Saxon) the general impression is that these burials tend to be later, with the majority of those that had accurate dates being founded in the sixth century, again matching the work of Williams. Finally the significantly high proportion of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries that were situated between five hundred metres and a kilometre from a site occupied in the fourth century suggests that, whilst these areas were not re-used for burial their presence was still an important factor in the location of the cemetery. The situation is, therefore more complex than the ritual appropriation of the past argued by Williams and may be the product of the cultural practices that create the variation in topographic setting discussed earlier.

In understanding the significance of the context of the cemeteries we must consider the social practices with which they are associated and consider that burial may have only been one aspect of the cultural activity that took place at these sites. As Williams (1999) stated, cultural features in the landscape may have provided a focus for group activities such as social assemblies or trade and exchange between different groups. The fact that not all Early Anglo-Saxon burials are associated with such features suggests that burial at these sites was reserved for certain individuals or groups, yet there is no evidence for significant differences in the mortuary rituals practiced at such cemeteries apart from the association with the existing cultural features. Furthermore the evidence from Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in general shows little evidence for the display of status of key individuals, as opposed to the situation at the end of the Early Anglo-Saxon period when individuals are buried in barrows, or in excessively rich graves at a time when the interment of the dead with grave goods was in decline. Instead the treatment of the dead in the fifth and sixth centuries appears to reflect the type of social identity that runs across a social group such as gender and age and the cemetery population may represent one or more kin based groups. In this case the decision to locate a cemetery on or close to a feature of cultural significance may reflect the relative status of that particular group. Williams' interpretation of the re-use of cultural features as representing the creation of an origin myth or a justification for claims over land is interesting but is heavily reliant upon an assumption that the people interring their dead in such a manner were part of an incoming group, for whom the establishment and subsequent recreation of an association with the landscape and history of this country is important. Such an approach is based entirely upon a traditionalist historical framework whereby the native population is either

displaced or subsumed within a migrant, Germanic, culture and fails to explain why so many cemeteries are not associated with either prehistoric or Roman features of the landscape.

Instead we should consider the broader context of these burials in the landscape of Early Anglo-Saxon Cambridgeshire and the general view of Early Anglo-Saxon mortuary behaviour outlined above. As has already been discussed the landscape was characterised by a pattern of dispersed settlement with areas of off-site activity, including both industrial and agricultural activities, lying peripheral to the main focus of settlement. Within certain parts of this landscape a close association is observed between settlements and cemeteries. This is either in the form of separate or small groups of settlements using a single cemetery, a small cluster of burial sites as in seen along the Cam or, distinct areas or zones of settlement activity lying adjacent to a similarly distinct area of cemeteries as is seen near Peterborough. The complexities of the social relations within the settlements is difficult to discern but the fact that there is no evidence for significantly larger or more prominent buildings might argue that the population of such sites was made up of a group or groups, possibly based on kin relations, that were largely equal in terms of their social standing. Furthermore the funerary evidence discussed earlier suggests that social differentiation ran within these groups rather than between them. The relationships between settlements need not, however, have been so egalitarian. The decision to situate some cemeteries in more prominent locations or in association with features of the cultural landscape may reflect differences in status or power relations between such groups. Furthermore, when we consider that other social activities may

have taken place at such sites we may suggest that such cemeteries were located at places where people from different settlement areas came together and that, within this sub-regional population, one group was dominant. The dead of this group were interred at a place where they displayed their social position above the rest of the local population, and this practice, along with the cultural associations of the meeting place embodied by its relationship with the physical and cultural landscape, was a way of recreating that social order. The presence of Early Anglo-Saxon burials around Roman towns can also be explained in this way, as these locations were important administrative and social centres in the fourth century, an importance that is retained in the fifth and sixth centuries and, in some cases, even later. Cambridge, for example became a meeting place of the Late Saxon hundred. Interestingly, another hundred meeting place in Cambridgeshire is Wandlebury, the site of a substantial prehistoric ring work and several barrows, one of which was re-used for burial in the Early Anglo-Saxon period.

Just as burial at places associated with the cultural landscape may have recreated the social order of an elite or dominant group, so too would the burial of the dead close to settlements have strengthened ties within the local population. In the south of the county, where settlements and cemeteries are closely related, group identity may have focused upon individual settlements, though such relationships may be more the product of the accident of archaeological recovery and may not be truly representative of the past. In the north of the county, however, settlements and cemeteries appear to form two groups that are spatially distinct from each other and may suggest a wider cultural affiliation.

5.3 *Conclusions*

This project has fulfilled the aims set out in the introduction; to characterise the nature of the available data and to use this to build a picture of the landscape of Cambridgeshire during the Early Anglo-Saxon period. To begin with it has been possible to show that the data-set is not representative of the situation in the past but is a reflection of the means by which our information is recovered. The decline in the number of settlements, for example, from the fourth to the fifth century is the result of differences in building material and the nature and deposition of material culture between the Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon periods. The project has also shown that the apparent discontinuity in the pattern of settlement that appears to characterise the transition between Roman and Saxon has come about by a tendency to focus on narrow research issues such as the ending of Roman Britain or the origins of Anglo-Saxon England. By grounding an examination of the Early Anglo-Saxon landscape in the broader context of the landscape through time it has can be shown that site abandonment and settlement shift is a feature common to much of the past. This is just one way in which the project has highlighted the complexities of the landscape at this time. Others include the high degree of variation in the pattern of settlement across the research area, differences in the types of settlement and settlement related sites and the dynamic relationship between settlements, cemeteries and the historical landscape.

However, as was mentioned at the start of this project, the amount of information that could be collected for each site and the level at which the inquiry would go to was limited in order to extend the project over such a wide area. In many ways this analysis has only

scratched the surface and a far more detailed approach is required in order to more fully understand the landscape of the Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon periods. The differences in the nature and deposition of material culture at different types of sites needs to be examined in order to appreciate the relationships between settlement sites. What, for example, were the functions of the off-site activity areas and why are they located where they are. The study of the different types of settlement related activity also needs to be extended into the Roman period to provide a fuller picture of the dynamics of landuse in the past. Only when a more detailed understanding of the landscape throughout the Roman period has been constructed can we hope to fully understand the relationship between the fourth and fifth centuries.




Figure 93: Map showing zones of settlement and cemetery in the north west of Cambridgeshire.




Figure 94: Comparison of the floor plan of the post hole building at Foxton (far right) with examples from Early Anglo-Saxon Settlements.

6 Appendix 1: Site Category Definitions.

Each site was placed within a category relating to the type of material present and the nature of the activity that might have taken place. A description of each category and the sorts of site that would be included under that heading is given below.

Category	Description
Ag/Ind buildings	Agricultural/Industrial buildings. Includes Anglo-Saxon sunken featured buildings.
Building Complex	Group of associated structures that may be considered as a single entity.
Burial. Fragmentary	Unstratified human remains
Burial. Multiple	Any find of more than one inhumation or cremation.
Burial. Single	Any find of a single inhumation or cremation.
Coin. Hoard	Group of coins found together.
Coin. Multiple	More than one coin finds from the same area.
Coin. Single	Single coin find.
Enclosure	Linear features enclosing an area
Enclosure. Multiple	Linear features enclosing a number of areas
Finds. Funerary	Unstratified finds generally characteristic of funerary activity
Metalwork	Finds of metal objects
Metalwork. Hoard	Group of metal objects deposited together
Occupation Debris	Finds of pottery and at least one other type of material recovered from the plough soil.
Occupation Debris. Multiple	More than one concentrations of pottery and at least one other type of material recovered from the plough soil.
Pottery	Finds of pottery with or without associated material
Pottery Scatter	Finds of pottery recovered from the plough soil
Pottery Scatter. Multiple	More than one concentrations of pottery recovered from the plough soil.
Sa/St or Sa/St	Roman salt working site recorded during field walking
Settlement features	Structural remains (including post hole buildings) and other associated features such as pits or ditches.
Small Town	Roman small town.

7 *Appendix 2: Catalogue of Sites*

Appendices

6 APPENDIX 1: SITE CATEGORY DEFINITIONS.

Each site was placed within a category relating to the type of material present and the nature of the activity that might have taken place. A description of each category and the sorts of site that would be included under that heading is given below.

Category	Description
Ag/Ind buildings	Agricultural/Industrial buildings. Includes Anglo-Saxon sunken featured buildings.
Building Complex	Group of associated structures that may be considered as a single entity.
Burial. Fragmentary	Unstratified human remains
Burial. Multiple	Any find of more than one inhumation or cremation.
Burial. Single	Any find of a single inhumation or cremation.
Coin. Hoard	Group of coins found together.
Coin. Multiple	More than one coin finds from the same area.
Coin. Single	Single coin find.
Enclosure	Linear features enclosing an area
Enclosure. Multiple	Linear features enclosing a number of areas
Finds. Funerary	Unstratified finds generally characteristic of funerary activity
Metalwork	Finds of metal objects
Metalwork. Hoard	Group of metal objects deposited together
Occupation Debris	Finds of pottery and at least one other type of material recovered from the plough soil.
Occupation Debris. Multiple	More than one concentrations of pottery and at least one other type of material recovered from the plough soil.
Pottery	Finds of pottery with or without associated material
Pottery Scatter	Finds of pottery recovered from the plough soil
Pottery Scatter. Multiple	More than one concentrations of pottery recovered from the plough soil.
Sa/St or Sa/St	Roman salt working site recorded during field walking
Settlement features	Structural remains (including post hole buildings) and other associated features such as pits or ditches.
Small Town	Roman small town.

7 APPENDIX 2: CATALOGUE OF SITES

System of referencing

- Fox 1923 *The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- FP(10) Fenland Project Report (Volume number)
- M.A Medieval Archaeology
- Meaney 1964 *A Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites* (London: George Allen and Unwin)
- PCAS Proceedings of the Cambridgeshire Antiquarian Society
- SMR Cambridgeshire County Sites and Monuments Record
- SMR-P Peterborough District Authority Sites and Monuments Record
- Scott 1993 *A Gazetteer of Roman Villas in Britain*. Leicester Archaeology Monographs 1 (Leicester: Leicester University Press)
- Taylor 1996 *Archaeology of Cambridgeshire Volume 1: South West Cambridgeshire* (Cambridge: Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Taylor 1998 *Archaeology of Cambridgeshire Volume 2: South East Cambridgeshire and the Fen Edge* (Cambridge: Cambridgeshire County Council)

SITE ID: 1 SMR NO: 2065
PARISH: ABBOTS RIPTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF A PIPELINE. 1984

SITE ID: 2 SMR NO: 03320C
PARISH: ABINGTON PIGGOTS

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 3 SMR NO: 2003
PARISH: AILSWORTH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
HUMAN REMAINS, METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 4 SMR NO: 50347
PARISH: ALWALTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BURIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 5 SMR NO:
PARISH: ALWALTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
URNS

SOURCE: M.A 1977
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 6 SMR NO: 6223
PARISH: BABRAHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 7 SMR NO: 11729
PARISH: BANTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
HUMAN BONE, SPEAR HEAD, BROOCH, POTTERY, INHUMATION, KNIFE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 8 SMR NO: 2145
PARISH: BANTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION, CREMATION, POTTERY, PIN, CEMETERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 9 SMR NO: 6386
PARISH: BALSHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 10 SMR NO: 38
PARISH: BARNACK

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, PIT, PH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 11 SMR NO: 00083C
PARISH: BARNACK

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, IRON WORKING

SOURCE: FP 7
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 12 SMR NO: 00071A
PARISH: BARNACK

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY, PIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 13 SMR NO: 3255
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
METALWORK (GRAVE GOODS)

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 14 SMR NO:
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS/GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 15 SMR NO: 2116
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 16 SMR NO:
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: M.A 1989,91,92
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 17 SMR NO: 03995B
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 18 SMR NO:
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, URN, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 19 SMR NO: 3264
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: MEANEY

SITE ID: 20 SMR NO: 3290
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 21 SMR NO: 3219
PARISH: BARRINGTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 22 SMR NO: 6132
PARISH: BARTLOW

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 23 SMR NO:
PARISH: BARTLOW

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STRUCTURES

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 24 SMR NO:
PARISH: BARTLOW

CATAGORY: BARROW METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BARROW

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 29 SMR NO: 6687
PARISH: BLUNTISHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
WALL, PITS, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 30 SMR NO: 00947A
PARISH: BLUNTISHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 31 SMR NO: 00929
PARISH: BLUNTISHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 32 SMR NO: 3661
PARISH: BLUNTISHAM

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
BEADS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 33 SMR NO: 4241
PARISH: BOROUGH FEN

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SETTLEMENT, POTTERY, QUERN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 34 SMR NO: 10396
PARISH: BOTTISHAM

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
2 CONCENTRIC RECTILINEAR STRUCTURES, DITCH ENCLOSED BUILDING, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 35 SMR NO: 06835A
PARISH: BOTTISHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE; VCH CAMBS 1978

SITE ID: 36 SMR NO: 6328
PARISH: BOTTISHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCH WKSHP

SITE ID: 37 SMR NO:
PARISH: BOTTISHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
CRUCIFORM BROOCH

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS: ARCH WORKSHOP

SITE ID: 38 SMR NO:
PARISH: BOTTISHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SMALL LONG BROOCH

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS: ARCH WORKSHOP

SITE ID: 39 SMR NO: 00951A
PARISH: BRAMPTON

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 40 SMR NO: 02498C
PARISH: BUCKDEN

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 41 SMR NO: 00861C
PARISH: BUCKDEN

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 42 SMR NO: 00771
PARISH: BUCKWORTH

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 43 SMR NO: 07458A
PARISH: BURWELL

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: FP, SMR

SITE ID: 44 SMR NO: 6736
PARISH: BURWELL

CATAGORY: METALWORK. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 45
PARISH: BURWELL

SMR NO: 6479

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 46
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO: 4642

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URNS, GRAVEGODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX

SITE ID: 47
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: BRITANNIA
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 48
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 20. 1989
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 49
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO: 4409

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX

SITE ID: 50
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO: 5480

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BROOCHS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 51
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO: 05421B

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURES, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 52
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

SMR NO: 4963

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 53 SMR NO: 04965A
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 54 SMR NO: 4997
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
CREMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX. MEANEY

SITE ID: 55 SMR NO: 05089A
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MA 15, 1971.PP13-37

SITE ID: 56 SMR NO: 4628
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 57 SMR NO: 4604
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 58 SMR NO: 4926
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS/URNS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 59 SMR NO:
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: PCAS 1981
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 60 SMR NO: 05424A
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
LAYERS, PITS, STRUCTURES

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS 43, 44, 56, 57

SITE ID: 61 SMR NO:
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 21. 1990
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 62 SMR NO: 05049B
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1910

DATA:
INHUMATIONS/URNS/GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: SEE WALKER 1912 PCAS XVI

SITE ID: 63 SMR NO:
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
METAL WORK (GRAVE GOODS)

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 64 SMR NO: 4735
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
STRUCTURES, BUILDING MATERIALS, POTTERY, COINS, PITS, DOMSTIC WASTE

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: VCH CAMBS 1978; JRS 56 AND 57; RCHM

SITE ID: 65 SMR NO: 4804
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
2 SMALL LONG FIBULAE

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 66 SMR NO: 4622
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX

SITE ID: 67 SMR NO: 5424
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY, STRUCTURES, WELL

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS 56, 57, 59, 43, 44; VCH CAMBS 1978

SITE ID: 68 SMR NO: 05251B
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 69 SMR NO: 5112
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POST HOLE BUILDING

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: BRITANNIA 9 1978

SITE ID: 70 SMR NO:
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 71 SMR NO: 04608A
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 72 SMR NO: 05421B
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURES, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 73 SMR NO: 5239
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: SMALL TOWN METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: VARIOUS

DATA:
LINEARS, STRUCTUTRES, WALLS, DEFENCES, POTTERY,INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: BAR 15, PCAS 74

SITE ID: 74 SMR NO: 4541
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 75 SMR NO: 5114
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
SPEARHEAD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 76 SMR NO: 5053
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1910

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: PCAS 16

SITE ID: 77 SMR NO: 5339
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
FINDS SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SITE ID: 78 SMR NO: 5336
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
FINDS SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX

SITE ID: 79 SMR NO: 5338
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
FINDS SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SITE ID: 80 SMR NO: 8066
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
PIT

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 81 SMR NO:
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1910

DATA:
METALWORK (GRAVE GOODS)

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 82 SMR NO: 4955
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 83 SMR NO: 05424A
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS 43, 44, 56, 57

SITE ID: 84 SMR NO: 05125B
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: FINDS. FUNERARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
POTTERY, GRAVEGOODS?

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SMR NO: 05087A

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1930

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 05243B

<u>METHOD OF</u>	EXCAVATION
<u>RECOVERY:</u>	
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1950

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 05111A

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1900

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 4674

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	19C

DATA:
DECORATED AND PLAIN POTTERY

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 89 SMR NO: 05177E
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 90 SMR NO: 4443
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX

SITE ID: 91 SMR NO: 05022B
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: FINDS. FUNERARY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
DECORATED POTTERY

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 92 SMR NO: 5109
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX

SITE ID: 93 SMR NO: 05177F
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 94 SMR NO: 5098
PARISH: CAMBRIDGE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 95 SMR NO: 11520
PARISH: CASTLE CAMPS

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
GIRDLE HANGER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 96 SMR NO:
PARISH: CASTLE CAMPS

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, METALWORK, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 97 SMR NO: 11922
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
DITCH, PITS, POSTHOLES

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 98 SMR NO: 09819A
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY, COIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 99 SMR NO: 8254
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
HANGING BOWL, HELMET

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 100 SMR NO: 916
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
METAL WORKING, POTTERY, CROP MARK

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: ANTIQUITY. 1930

SITE ID: 101 SMR NO: 11922
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
DITCH, PITS, POSTHOLES

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 102 SMR NO: 1873
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STRUCTURES, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: BRITANNIA 2, 3, 5, 7; DUROBRIVAE 9

SITE ID: 103 SMR NO: 1872
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURE

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 104 SMR NO: 10383
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
PIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 105 SMR NO:
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURES, POTTERY

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 5. 1974
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 106 SMR NO:
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 6. 1975
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 107 SMR NO: 50156
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
WRIST CLASP

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 108 SMR NO: 646
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, PIT, COMB, KNIFE, SHEARS, HUT, CLASP, ? SUNKEN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 109 SMR NO: 10395
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BUILDING, COIN HOARD, DITCH, CREMATION, TILE, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC, ANNUAL REPORT 1990

SITE ID: 110 SMR NO: 10085
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION, SHOE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 111 SMR NO: 1870
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
POTTERY, BOTTLE, BEAD, BRACELET, PIN, KEY, SHACKLE, COIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH; ARCH J 115

SITE ID: 112 SMR NO: 01901C
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
DITCH, ENCLOSURE, BUILDING, BUILDING MATERIAL,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH; NVRC ANNUAL REPORT

SITE ID: 113 SMR NO: 02640A
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 114 SMR NO:
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRUCTURES

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 14. 1983
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 115 SMR NO:
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURE, POTTERY

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 9. 1978
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 116 SMR NO: 2367
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
POTTERY KILN, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: ARCH J 131; RCHM HUTNS; ARTIS-DUROBRIVAE

SITE ID: 117 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHATTERIS

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DARK AREA, COIN HOARD

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 118 SMR NO: 1513
PARISH: CHATTERIS

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 119 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHATTERIS

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 120 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHATTERIS

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN HOARD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 121 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHATTERIS

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 122 SMR NO: 1867
PARISH: CHESTERTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 123 SMR NO: 11841
PARISH: CHEVELEY

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 124 SMR NO: 11842
PARISH: CHEVELEY

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
KNIFE

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 125 SMR NO: 7631
PARISH: CHIPPENHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 126 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHIPPENHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: MEANEY

SITE ID: 127 SMR NO:
PARISH: CONNINGTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, DOMESTIC WASTE, DARK AREA

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 128 SMR NO:
PARISH: COTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRAY FIND. BROOCH

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 129
PARISH: COTTENHAM

SMR NO: 5743

CATAGORY: LINEARS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF CROP MARK
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 130
PARISH: COTTENHAM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DOMESTRIC REFUSE, POTTERY, DARK AREA

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 131
PARISH: COTTENHAM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DOMESTIC REFUSE, POTTERY, DARK AREA

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 132
PARISH: COTTENHAM

SMR NO: ?

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 133 SMR NO:
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BURNT STONE, QUERN, POTTERY, DARK AREA

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 134 SMR NO: 5637
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 135 SMR NO: 5237
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 136 SMR NO: 5199
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
COINS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 5938

METHOD OF RECOVERY: NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
DISCOVERY: 19C

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 5497

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1930

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 5503

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 05503A

<u>METHOD OF</u>	UNKNOWN
<u>RECOVERY:</u>	
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: JRS46, 1956
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 141 SMR NO: 5502
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 142 SMR NO: 5365
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 143 SMR NO: 5237
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
4 COINS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 144 SMR NO: 05360A
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, CROP MARK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 145 SMR NO: 5501
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 146 SMR NO: 05503A
PARISH: COTTENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: JRS46, 1956 P.138
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 147 SMR NO: 9786
PARISH: CROXTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY VESSEL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 148 SMR NO: 01216G
PARISH: CROYDON

CATAGORY: LINEARS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
LINEAR, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: MA 1965

SITE ID: 149 SMR NO:
PARISH: DIDDINGTON
CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990
DATA:
?

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 24. 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 150 SMR NO:
PARISH: DIDDINGTON
CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990
DATA:
?

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 25. 1994
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 151 SMR NO: 3678
PARISH: DODDINGTON
CATAGORY: FINDS. FUNERARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C
DATA:
URNS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 152 SMR NO: 5896
PARISH: DODDINGTON

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C
DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 153 SMR NO: 1465
PARISH: DRY DRAYTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: ? RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
HUMAN REMAINS

SOURCE: M.A 1970
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 154 SMR NO: 00380
PARISH: DRY DRAYTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRAY FIND

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 155 SMR NO: 11698A
PARISH: DUXFORD

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 156 SMR NO: 1814
PARISH: EARITH

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 157 SMR NO:
PARISH: EARITH

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
LINEARS ENCLOSURE, PITS, STRUCTURE, POTTERY

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 6. 1975
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 158 SMR NO: 3568
PARISH: EARITH

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY VESSEL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 159 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 160 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA,, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 161 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, SMALL ENCLOSURE (CROPMRK)

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 162 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BRIQUATAGE, CROP MARK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 163 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERN, BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY, DARK AREA

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 164 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 165 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 166 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY SCATTER, ENCLOSURES (CROP MARK)

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 167 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 168 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 169
PARISH: ELM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 170
PARISH: ELM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERN, BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 171
PARISH: ELM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERN, BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 172
PARISH: ELM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF CROP MARK
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, ENCLOSURES AND DROVEWAYS (CROP MARKS)

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 173 SMR NO: 4163
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE FP

SITE ID: 174 SMR NO: 4150
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 175 SMR NO: 1862
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: METALWORK. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
METALWORK, SALTERN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 176 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELM

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 177 SMR NO: 05577A
PARISH: ELTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 178 SMR NO: 05577B
PARISH: ELTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: M.A 1978
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 179 SMR NO: 00117
PARISH: ELTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, STONE

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 180 SMR NO: 1601
PARISH: ELTON

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURES

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: BRITANNIA 2, 1971

SITE ID: 181 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY,

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 182 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BURNT STONE

SOURCE: FB 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 183 SMR NO: 2104
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
INHUMATIONS.

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 184 SMR NO: 7085
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 185 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 186 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 187 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 188 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: M.A 1960
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 189 SMR NO: 6963
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 190 SMR NO:
PARISH: ELY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: BUSHNELL AND CRA'STER 1959 IN PCAS 53

SITE ID: 191 SMR NO: 6861
PARISH: ETON

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 192 SMR NO:
PARISH: EXNING

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: PCAS 1987
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 193 SMR NO:
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
?

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS 48, 1988

SITE ID: 194 SMR NO: 2997
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
SETTLEMENT, POTTERY, TILE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 195 SMR NO: 3112
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
POTTERY, SPEAR, KNIFE, BROOCH, PURSE RING, CLASP, INHUMATION

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: FP; MEANEY

SITE ID: 196 SMR NO: 3055
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
BROOCH, POTTERY, INHUMATION, SPEAR, KNIFE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: DUROBRIVAE 1980

SITE ID: 197 SMR NO: 3066
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
SETTLEMENT, TILE, QUERN, POTTERY, COFFIN, SKELETON, DITCH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 198 SMR NO: 2967
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
KILNS, LINEARS, POTTERY, STRUCTURES

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 199 SMR NO: 03073A
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1910

DATA:
INHUMATION, WRIST, CLASP, BEAD, BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: PSA 24, 27; NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1985

SITE ID: 200 SMR NO: 50250
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 201 SMR NO: 50250
PARISH: EYE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 202 SMR NO: 02957A
PARISH: FARCET

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 203 SMR NO:
PARISH: FEN DITTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, METALWORK

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 204 SMR NO: 03647A
PARISH: FEN DRAYTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
LINEARS, MOUND, POTTERY, STRUCTURES

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: CBA GROUP 7 BULL

SITE ID: 205 SMR NO:
PARISH: FEN DRAYTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 206 SMR NO: 00878
PARISH: FENSTANTON

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 207 SMR NO: 9965
PARISH: FENSTANTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 209 SMR NO: 12012
PARISH: FENSTANTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 210 SMR NO: 01792A
PARISH: FENSTANTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, LINEARS, PITS, ENCLOSURES

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 211 SMR NO: 3460
PARISH: FENSTANTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COINS, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 212 SMR NO: 3486
PARISH: FENSTANTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 213 SMR NO: 07579A
PARISH: FORDHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 214 SMR NO:
PARISH: FORDHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 215 SMR NO:
PARISH: FORDHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 216 SMR NO:
PARISH: FORDHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 217 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, METALWORK, CEMETERY

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 218 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
FEATURES

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 219 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 220 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 221 SMR NO: 4209
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 222 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
IRON HOARD

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 223 SMR NO: 3989
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 224 SMR NO:
PARISH: FULBOURN

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 225 SMR NO:
PARISH: GAMLINGAY

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY, PHB, SFB, ENCLOSURES, OCCUPATION DEBRIS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 226 SMR NO: 11980A
PARISH: GAMLINGAY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 227 SMR NO: 5274
PARISH: GIRTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, URNS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SITE ID: 228 SMR NO: 5274
PARISH: GIRTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, URNS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SITE ID: 229 SMR NO: 02179B
PARISH: GLINTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 230 SMR NO:
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: SMALL TOWN METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
STRUCTURES, POTTERY, COINS, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 231 SMR NO: 2734
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 232 SMR NO: 00883
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
PIT, COIN, DOMESTIC REFUSE

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 233 SMR NO: 00953
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
COINS, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 234
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 00955

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 235
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 00855

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 236
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 00893

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 237
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 02715A

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
URN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 238
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 02715C

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 239
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 1544

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, FINDS SCATTER

SOURCE: M.A 1975
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 240
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 00926

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BUILDING, LINEARS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 241
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

SMR NO: 1536

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURE, PIT

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 242 SMR NO: 01541A
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: LINEARS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
LINEARS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 243 SMR NO: 1541
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
PIT,BUILDING, INDUSTRIAL, DOMESTIC REFUSE

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 244 SMR NO: 00849
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
LINEARS, COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 245 SMR NO: 2246
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
STRUCTURES, LINEARS, POTTERY, MOSAICS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:SEE: BRITANNIA 7, 22; JRS 45, 48, 56, 58; PCAS 61

SITE ID: 246 SMR NO:
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, POTTERY

SOURCE: GREEN
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 247 SMR NO: 00956
PARISH: GODMANCHESTER

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 248 SMR NO:
PARISH: GRANDFORD

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: PCAS 1980
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 249 SMR NO:
PARISH: GRANTCHESTER

CATAGORY: FINDS. FUNERARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STRAY FINDS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 250 SMR NO: 4854
PARISH: GRANTCHESTER

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SITE ID: 251 SMR NO:
PARISH: GRANTCHESTER

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: M.A 1972
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 252 SMR NO: 05166A
PARISH: GRANTCHESTER

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1910

DATA:
COMB

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: PCAS 22, 1921

SITE ID: 253 SMR NO: 6227
PARISH: GREAT ABINGTON

CATAGORY: EARTHWORK METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
EARTHWORK, LINEAR WITH DITCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 254 SMR NO:
PARISH: GREAT CHESTERFORD

CATAGORY: SMALL TOWN METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURES, POTTERY, COINS, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE:
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 255 SMR NO: 11748C
PARISH: GREAT GIDDING

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COINS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 257 SMR NO: 2338
PARISH: GREAT GRANSDEN

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
POTTERY, COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 258 SMR NO: 01059C
PARISH: GREAT HEMINGFORD

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 259 SMR NO: 05090A
PARISH: GREAT SHELFORD

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY,LINEARS,STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 260 SMR NO:
PARISH: GREAT SHELFORD

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
?

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 13. 1982
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 261 SMR NO:
PARISH: GREAT SHELFORD

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 262 SMR NO:
PARISH: GREAT STAUGHTON

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
STRUCTURES, MOSAICS, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS 49, 50

SITE ID: 263 SMR NO:
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, BUILDING MATERIAL, METALWORK, POTTERY, DOMESTIC REFUSE, PITS

SOURCE: PCAS 1990
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 264 SMR NO: 2670
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
LOOM WIEGHTS

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 265 SMR NO: 05959B
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 266 SMR NO: 05959B
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY, BONE

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 267 SMR NO: 6270
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
PIT/SFB?

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 268 SMR NO: 6264
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 269 SMR NO: 6277
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 270 SMR NO: 06253A
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SPEARHEAD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCH WKSP

SITE ID: 271 SMR NO: 6259
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRAP END

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCH WKSP

SITE ID: 272 SMR NO: 06320B
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURE, METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: TAYLOR

SITE ID: 273 SMR NO: 6375
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
INHUMATION, SPEAR, SHIELD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 274 SMR NO: 6263
PARISH: GREAT WILLBRAHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCH WKSHP

SITE ID: 275 SMR NO: 00662

PARISH: GULDEN MORDEN

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 277 SMR NO:

PARISH: GUYHIRN

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURAL?

SOURCE: PCAS 1991

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 278 SMR NO:

PARISH: HADDENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 279 SMR NO: 5621

PARISH: HADDENHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF UNKNOWN
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 280 SMR NO:
PARISH: HADDENHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: M.A 1991
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 281 SMR NO:
PARISH: HADDENHAM

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
EARTHWORK, ENCLOSURE, BARROW, STRUCTURES.

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 282 SMR NO: 10384
PARISH: HADDON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BUILDING COMPLEX

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC, ANNUAL REPORT 1991, 1992, 1993

SITE ID: 283 SMR NO: 10384
PARISH: HADDON

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BUILDING COMPLEX

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC, ANNUAL REPORT 1991, 1992, 1993

SITE ID: 284 SMR NO:
PARISH: HADDON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, LINEARS

SOURCE: PCAS 1990
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 285 SMR NO: 9748
PARISH: HADDON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, STRUCTURES

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 286 SMR NO: 3439
PARISH: HARLTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 287 SMR NO: 3438
PARISH: HARLTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 290 SMR NO:
PARISH: HARSTON
CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990
DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: M.A 1992
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 291 SMR NO: 4122
PARISH: HARSTON
CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990
DATA:
SFB, LINEARS, INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: M.A 1992
FURTHER REFS:SEE: PCAS 1991

SITE ID: 292 SMR NO: 2850
PARISH: HARSTON
CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960
DATA:
DISC

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 293 SMR NO: 05074A
PARISH: HARSTON
CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970
DATA:
STRUCTURES, KILNS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 9. 1978
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 294 SMR NO:
PARISH: HARSTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 295 SMR NO: 4816
PARISH: HASLINGFIELD

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URNS, INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FOX, MEANEY

SITE ID: 296 SMR NO: 4727
PARISH: HASLINGFIELD

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY, COINS, LINEARS (CROP MARKS)

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 297 SMR NO: 4342
PARISH: HASLINGFIELD

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1910

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCHAEOLOGY, 63. 1911

SITE ID: 298 SMR NO: 4341
PARISH: HASLINGFIELD

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: PCAS 61, 1968

SITE ID: 299 SMR NO: 4387
PARISH: HAUXTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCHAE, 74. 1922

SITE ID: 300 SMR NO: 04979B
PARISH: HAUXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 301 SMR NO: 2262
PARISH: HELPSTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
LIMEKILN, POTTERY, COIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: JRS, 51; DUROBRIVAE 4

SITE ID: 302 SMR NO: 620
PARISH: HELPSTON

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
VILLA, TESSELLATED, PAVEMENT, TILE, BRICK, ? TEMPLE?, BUILDING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: JRS 1968; DUROBRIVAE 1975

SITE ID: 303 SMR NO:
PARISH: HEYDON

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, METALWORK

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 304 SMR NO: 6070
PARISH: HILDERSHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
HANGING BOWL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 305 SMR NO:
PARISH: HINXTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
?

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 306
PARISH: HINXTON

SMR NO: 11687B

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
LINEARS, POTTRERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 307
PARISH: HINXTON

SMR NO: 11978B

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
LINEARS, PIT, SFB

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE TAYLOR

SITE ID: 308
PARISH: HINXTON

SMR NO: 11687B

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POST HOLE BUILDING

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 309
PARISH: HINXTON

SMR NO: 9236

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 5196

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1970

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO:

<u>METHOD OF</u>	EXCAVATION
<u>RECOVERY:</u>	
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1910

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 6335

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1930

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO: 05423A

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1930

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 314 SMR NO:

PARISH: HORSEHEATH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 315 SMR NO:

PARISH: HORSEHEATH

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, POTTERY, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 316 SMR NO: 2767

PARISH: HOUGHTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SPEARHEAD

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 317 SMR NO: 2695

PARISH: HOUGHTON AND

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 318 SMR NO: 1935
PARISH: HOUGHTON AND

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 319 SMR NO: 2817
PARISH: HOUGHTON AND WYTON

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 320 SMR NO:
PARISH: HUNTINGDON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
LINEARS, PITS,, CORN DRIER

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 6. 1975
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 321 SMR NO: 1946
PARISH: HUNTINGDON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
URN, BONE, METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 322
PARISH: ICKLETON

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 323
PARISH: ISLEHAM

SMR NO: 7541

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 324
PARISH: ISLEHAM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF CROP MARK
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIALS, COINS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 325
PARISH: KIMBOLTON

SMR NO: 00429C

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 1985 P76-78

SITE ID: 326
PARISH: KIMBOLTON

SMR NO: 00416

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN/BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 327
PARISH: KNAPWELL

SMR NO: 11069

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 328
PARISH: LANDBEACH

SMR NO: 5357

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 329
PARISH: LANDBEACH

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
POTTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 330 SMR NO:
PARISH: LANDBEACH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
DOMESTIC WASTE, POTTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 331 SMR NO:
PARISH: LANDBEACH

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS (CROP MARK ENCLOSURES), POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 332 SMR NO:
PARISH: LANDBEACH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DOMESTIC WASTE, POTTERY, LINEARS, KILN BARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 333 SMR NO:
PARISH: LANDBEACH

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS (CROP MARK ENCLOSURES), POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 335 SMR NO:
PARISH: LEVERINGTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
20 COMPLETE POTS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 336 SMR NO: 11815
PARISH: LINTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 337 SMR NO: 06179A
PARISH: LINTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URN, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 338 SMR NO: 9841
PARISH: LINTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STRUCTURES, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY, GLASS, COINS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 343 SMR NO: 6114
PARISH: LINTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
URNS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 344 SMR NO:
PARISH: LINTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 345 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLE DOWNHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE; PHILLIPS, C. W 1939. BRITAIN IN THE DARK

SITE ID: 346 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLE DOWNHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 347 SMR NO:

PARISH: LITTLE DOWNHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER

PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:

POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 348 SMR NO:

PARISH: LITTLE DOWNHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER

PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:

POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 349 SMR NO: 11773

PARISH: LITTLE DOWNHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK

PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:

CRUCIFORM BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 350 SMR NO: 11762B

PARISH: LITTLE DOWNHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK

PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:

GIRDLE HANGER

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 351 SMR NO: 00628
PARISH: LITTLE PAXTON

CATAGORY: FINDS. FUNERARY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
URN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS62, 59-99

SITE ID: 352 SMR NO: 11288
PARISH: LITTLE PAXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
URN, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 353 SMR NO: 4803
PARISH: LITTLE SHELFORD

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 354 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLE THETFORD

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 355 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLE THETFORD

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 356 SMR NO: 6330
PARISH: LITTLE WILBRAHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, URNS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: FOX 1923
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 357 SMR NO: 6303
PARISH: LITTLE WILBRAHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 358 SMR NO: 7661
PARISH: LITTLEPORT

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY VESSEL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 359 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLEPORT

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
POTTERY, POSS STRUCTURES

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 360 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLEPORT

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 361 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLEPORT

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, SALTEN DEBRIS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 362 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLEPORT

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS, SFB

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 363 SMR NO: 6615
PARISH: LODE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL, COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SCOTT 1993

SITE ID: 364 SMR NO:
PARISH: LODE

CATAGORY: FINDS. METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
CYSTAL BEAD

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 365 SMR NO:
PARISH: LODE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
CRUCIFORM BROOCH

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 367 SMR NO:
PARISH: LODE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
FINDS SCATTER

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 368 SMR NO:
PARISH: LONGSTANTON

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: PCAS 1991
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 369 SMR NO:
PARISH: LONGTHORPE

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE. MULTIPLE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
LINEAR ENCLOSURES

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 2. 1971
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 370 SMR NO:
PARISH: LONGTHORPE

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
CORN DRIER, STRCUTURE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 4. 1973
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 371 SMR NO:
PARISH: MANEA

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, OCCUPATION DEBRIS

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 372 SMR NO:
PARISH: MANEA
CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980
DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER
SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 373 SMR NO: 5940
PARISH: MARCH
CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980
DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY, DOMESTIC REFUSE
SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 374 SMR NO:
PARISH: MARCH
CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS. METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980
DATA:
DARK AREAS, DOMESTIC REFUSE, POTTERY
SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 375 SMR NO:
PARISH: MARCH
CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980
DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY, BRIQ
SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 376
PARISH: MARCH

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/ST
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERN, DARK AREA, POTTERY, DOMESTIC REFUSE

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 377
PARISH: MARCH

SMR NO: 8445

CATAGORY: SA/ST
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY, DARK AREA

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 58, BRITTANIA 12

SITE ID: 378
PARISH: MARCH

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SMALL TOWN
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF CROP MARK
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
CM, HOARD (METAL DETECTED), POTTERY, DOMESTIC REFUSE, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 379
PARISH: MARCH

SMR NO: 1511

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SMR NO:

PARISH: MARCH

CATEGORY: HOARD

PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:

HOARD (METAL DETECTED)

SOURCE: FP 2

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 381

SMR NO: 8199

PARISH: MARCH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS

PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:

POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: FP 2

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 382

SMR NO:

PARISH: MARCH

CATAGORY: SA/SE

PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:

BRIQUATAGE, DARK AREA, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 2

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 383

SMR NO: 3781

PARISH: MARCH

CATAGORY: METALWORK

PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL

RECOVERY:

DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:

BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 384 SMR NO: 4566
PARISH: MARHOLM

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE. MULTIPLE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
ENCLOSURE, DITCH, TRACKWAY, BUILDING, LINEAR FEATURE, PIT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 385 SMR NO: 02151A
PARISH: MAXEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF REPORTED OBSERVATIONS
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC 1980

SITE ID: 386 SMR NO: 02151A
PARISH: MAXEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF REPORTED OBSERVATIONS
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC 1980

SITE ID: 387 SMR NO: 2151
PARISH: MAXEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: NENE VALLEY REPORT 1979-80

SITE ID: 388 SMR NO:
PARISH: MAXEY

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY, LINEARS, KILNS

SOURCE: FP 7
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 389 SMR NO: 3161
PARISH: MELBOURN

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GAVE GOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 49, 1956

SITE ID: 390 SMR NO:
PARISH: MELDRETH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY,METALWORK

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 391 SMR NO:
PARISH: MILKING HILLS

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 392 SMR NO:
PARISH: MILTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 24. 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 393 SMR NO:
PARISH: MILTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, BARROW

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 394 SMR NO: 5538
PARISH: MILTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 395 SMR NO: 5540
PARISH: MILTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 396 SMR NO:
PARISH: MILTON

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
KILNS, POTTERY, COINS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 28. 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 397 SMR NO: 50293
PARISH: NASSINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
CEMETERY, SETTLEMENT, JEWELRY, POTTERY, BONES

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 398 SMR NO: 50293
PARISH: NASSINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
CEMETERY, SETTLEMENT, JEWELRY, POTTERY, BONES

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 399 SMR NO: 50318
PARISH: NASSINGTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 1985 P73-75

SITE ID: 404 SMR NO: 01621A
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
TESSELLATED, PAVEMENT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM, HUNTS,

SITE ID: 405 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURE, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 406 SMR NO: 01961B/
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
CROPMARK, SETTLEMENT, COIN, POTTERY, FARMSTEAD, BARN, PIT, WALL,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: MA 18; NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1976;

SITE ID: 407 SMR NO: 50386
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 408 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 5. 1974
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 409 SMR NO: 1806
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
SUNKEN FEATURED BUILDING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 410 SMR NO: 01808B
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
SETTLEMENT, VILLAGE, POTTERY, COIN, PIT, BATH HOUSE, FURNACE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM HUNTS; RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 411 SMR NO: 01808C
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, BUCKET, FITTING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 412 SMR NO: 01807F
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
VILLAGE, POTTERY, COMB, PIN, ANIMAL BONE, SPINDLE WHORL,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 413 SMR NO: 01961B/
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
CROPMARK, SETTLEMENT, COIN, POTTERY, FARMSTEAD, BARN, PIT, WALL,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: MA 18; NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1976;

SITE ID: 414 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
FURNACES, AGRICULTURAL FEATURES, STRUCTURES

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 4. 1973
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 415 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORTON LONGUEVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURES, POTTERY, CORN DRIERS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 8. 1977
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 416 SMR NO: 917
PARISH: ORTON WATERVILLE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
CEMETERY, POTTERY, HUMAN BONE, ANIMAL BONE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC ANNUAL REPORT. 1975; MED ARCH 21;

SITE ID: 417 SMR NO: 01433B
PARISH: ORTON WATERVILLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
PITS, LINEARS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 4. 1973
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 418 SMR NO: 9820
PARISH: ORTON WATERVILLE

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
WORK SHOP, CORN DRYING KILN, DRAIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 419 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORTON WATERVILLE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 4. 1973
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 420 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORWELL

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 421 SMR NO: 3269
PARISH: ORWELL

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 422 SMR NO:
PARISH: ORWELL

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: PCAS 1991
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 423 SMR NO: 00284A
PARISH: OVER

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
KILNS, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: PHILLIPS 1970

SITE ID: 424 SMR NO:
PARISH: PAMPISFORD

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
MEATLWORK

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 425 SMR NO:
PARISH: PAMPISFORD

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
LINEARS

SOURCE: M.A 1996
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 1994

SITE ID: 426 SMR NO:
PARISH: PAMPISFORD

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: M.A 1996
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 1994

SITE ID: 427 SMR NO:
PARISH: PARSON DROVE

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, ENCLOSURES (CROP MARK)

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 428 SMR NO:
PARISH: PARSON DROVE

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, CROP MARK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 429 SMR NO:
PARISH: PARSON DROVE

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 430 SMR NO:
PARISH: PARSON DROVE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 431 SMR NO: 2160
PARISH: PEAKIRK

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1980

SMR NO: 2199

PARISH: PEAKIRK

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	REPORTED OBSERVATIONS
DISCOVERY:	1970

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P

FURTHER REFS: NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1980

SITE ID: 433

SMR NO: 8251

PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BEAD, CREMATION, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 434

SMR NO: 10595B

PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	EXCAVATION
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1990

DATA:
BROOCH, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 435

SMR NO: 2189

PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES
PERIOD: RB

<u>METHOD OF</u>	EXCAVATION
<u>RECOVERY:</u>	
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1970

DATA:
DITCH, PIT, POTTERY, SETTLEMENT, HOUSE, COIN

SOURCE: SMR-P

FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 436 SMR NO: 936
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
BROOCH, POTTERY, COIN, DITCH, TILE, FARMSTEAD, TESSERAЕ

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: BRITANNIA, 5,

SITE ID: 437 SMR NO: 2202
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1980

SITE ID: 438 SMR NO: 596
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
STRUCTURE, POTTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS 53 1963; RCHM 1969

SITE ID: 439 SMR NO: 523
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
KILN FURNITURE, QUERN, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH.

SITE ID: 440 SMR NO: 1751
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 441 SMR NO: 10090A
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 442 SMR NO: 1381
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, SETTLEMENT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 443 SMR NO: 2969
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 444 SMR NO: 00936A
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURES, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 5. 1974
FURTHER REFS: SEE: DUROBRIVAE 11, 1974;

SITE ID: 445 SMR NO: 00936A
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
METAL WORK, LINEARS. SFB

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 5. 1974
FURTHER REFS: SEE: DUROBRIVAE 11, 1974;

SITE ID: 446 SMR NO: 10086
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 447 SMR NO: 1381
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, SETTLEMENT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 448 SMR NO: 2972
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
CAULDRON, BRONZE VESSEL

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: DUROBRIVAE 4

SITE ID: 449 SMR NO: 3128
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
KILN, POTTERY, KILN WASTE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: JRS 57, 58; NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1990

SITE ID: 450 SMR NO: 1666
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
CEMETERY, CREMATION, INHUMATION, BROOCH, URN, SPEAR HEAD, KNIFE,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 451 SMR NO:
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 13. 1982
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 452 SMR NO: 1416
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: FINDS. FUNERARY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 453 SMR NO: 1716
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
CEMETERY, HUMAN BONE, BROOCH, BEAD, BUCKLE, KNIFE, KEY, RING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH; MA 8

SITE ID: 454 SMR NO: 1600
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 455 SMR NO: 1405
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 456 SMR NO: 01382A
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
CREMATION, CEMETERY, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: JRS 55, 58, 59; RCHM PETERBOROUGH; MED

SITE ID: 457 SMR NO: 3153
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
KILN, POTTERY, COIN, ROAD, WHARF, SETTLEMENT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 458 SMR NO: 8197
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BEAD

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 459 SMR NO: 8223
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: ARCH J 120

SITE ID: 460
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

SMR NO: 1668

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
FINGER RING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 461
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

SMR NO: 08762A

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 462
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

SMR NO: 01518A

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
COIN, POTTERY KILN, POTTERY, TILE, INSCRIPTION

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: PROC SOC ANTIQ, 88: ARCH J, 41; RCHM

SITE ID: 463
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

SMR NO: 1431

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
SPEAR

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: PETERBOROUGH MUSEUM ANNUAL REPORT,

SITE ID: 464 SMR NO: 1751
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
COIN, POTTERY, ANIMAL BONE, LOOM WEIGHT, CEMETERY, TILE,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM PETERBOROUGH

SITE ID: 465 SMR NO: 01631A
PARISH: PETERBOROUGH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
VILLAGE, POTTERY, POST HOLE, DITCH, BUILDING, QUERNH,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 466 SMR NO:
PARISH: SANDY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: JOHNSTON
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 467 SMR NO:
PARISH: SANDY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: JOHNSTON
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 468 SMR NO:
PARISH: SANDY
CATAGORY: SMALL TOWN METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURES, POTTERY, COINS, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE:
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 469 SMR NO: 4537
PARISH: SAWSTON
CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: ARCHAEOLOGY, 18. FOX. MEANEY

SITE ID: 470 SMR NO: 04112
PARISH: SAWSTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 471 SMR NO:
PARISH: SAWTREY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DARK STAIN

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 472 SMR NO:
PARISH: SAWTREY JUDITH

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 473 SMR NO:
PARISH: SHELFORD

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE. MULTIPLE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 11. 1980
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 474 SMR NO: 4703
PARISH: SHELFORD

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
COINS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 475 SMR NO:
PARISH: SHELFORD

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS, PITS, QUARRIES

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 13. 1982
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 476 SMR NO:
PARISH: SHINGAY

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1997
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 477 SMR NO: 170
PARISH: SIBSON CUM STIBBINGTON

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STUCTURES, KILNS, POTTERY, PITS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: ARCH J 114; JRS 48; BRITANNIA 1

SITE ID: 478 SMR NO: 00177
PARISH: SIBSUM CUM STIBBING

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 479 SMR NO:
PARISH: SNAILWELL

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 480 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
SPEAR HEAD

SOURCE: M.A 1962-3
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 481 SMR NO: 7045
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY, BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 482 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
METALWORK AND COINS AND POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: GAZETEER

SITE ID: 483 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRAY FINDS

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 484 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SPEAR HEAD

SOURCE: PCAS 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 485 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
LINEARS, HOARD, ENCLOSURES, DOMESTIC REFUSE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 486 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 487 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 488
PARISH: SOHAM

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: HOARD
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
HOARD

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 489
PARISH: SOHAM

SMR NO: 11690

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
AXE HEAD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 490
PARISH: SOHAM

SMR NO: 04456D

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: PCAS 74

SITE ID: 491
PARISH: SOHAM

SMR NO: 07560A

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF UNKNOWN
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL, PITS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 492 SMR NO: 07375A
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: MEANEY

SITE ID: 493 SMR NO: 7120
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 494 SMR NO: 4471
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 495 SMR NO:
PARISH: SOHAM

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
POTTERY, METALWORK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: MEANEY

SITE ID: 496
PARISH: SOMERSHAM

SMR NO: 3670

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 497
PARISH: SOMERSHAM

SMR NO: 3651

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
URN, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 498
PARISH: SOMERSHAM

SMR NO: 1569

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 499
PARISH: SOMERSHAM

SMR NO: 3689

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
POTTERY VESSELS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 504 SMR NO: 00603
PARISH: SOUTHOE

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COINS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 505 SMR NO: 11337
PARISH: SOUTHOE AND MIDLOE

CATAGORY: MOULD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BROOCH MOULD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 506 SMR NO: 11338
PARISH: SOUTHOE AND MIDLOE

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
CRUCIFORM BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 507 SMR NO: 50016
PARISH: SOUTHORPE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COFFIN, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 508 SMR NO: 62
PARISH: SOUTHORPE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
CEMETERY, COIN, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: ARCHAEOLOGIA 1.

SITE ID: 509 SMR NO: 1388
PARISH: SOUTHORPE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF REPORTED OBSERVATIONS
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
COFFIN, POTTERY, BURIAL

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC, ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

SITE ID: 510 SMR NO: 3596
PARISH: ST IVES

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 511 SMR NO: 00770
PARISH: ST IVES

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 512
PARISH: ST IVES

SMR NO: 3557

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 513
PARISH: ST IVES

SMR NO: 00709

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF UNKNOWN
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 514
PARISH: ST IVES

SMR NO: 00459

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 515
PARISH: ST IVES

SMR NO: 1489

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 516
PARISH: ST IVES

SMR NO: 03594B

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 517
PARISH: ST NEOTS

SMR NO: 00392

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF UNKNOWN
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URNS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 518
PARISH: ST NEOTS

SMR NO: 00395

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF UNKNOWN
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
SFB

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: SEE: BERESFORD AND HURST, DMV AND

SITE ID: 519
PARISH: ST NEOTS

SMR NO: 11509

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 520 SMR NO: 00396A
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
STRUCTURE, BUILDING MATERIAL, INHUMATION, POTTERY, GLASS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE; CGA GROUP 7 BULL

SITE ID: 521 SMR NO: 00574
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
URN, INHUMATIONS, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 522 SMR NO: 11496
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 523 SMR NO: 00525
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
URN, BEADS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 524 SMR NO: 00516
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
COFFINS, INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 525 SMR NO: 11779
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 526 SMR NO: 00408
PARISH: ST NEOTS

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 527 SMR NO:
PARISH: STANGROUND

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
KILNS, POTTERY SCATTER, WARF

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS: PART OF A LARGER POTTERY COMPLEX,

SITE ID: 528 SMR NO:
PARISH: STANGROUND

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 529 SMR NO: 2265
PARISH: STEEPLE MORDEN

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INUHMATION, BEAD, BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 530 SMR NO:
PARISH: STILTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 16. 1985
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 531 SMR NO:
PARISH: STONEA GRANGE

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, LINEARS, PITS, KILNS

SOURCE: M.A 1982, 83, 84
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 532 SMR NO:
PARISH: STONEA GRANGE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB AND A/S RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, LINEARS

SOURCE: M.A 1982, 83, 84
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 533 SMR NO:
PARISH: STONEA GRANGE

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
BUIDLDING MATERIAL, FOUNDATIONS

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 534 SMR NO: 6915
PARISH: STRETHAM

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 535 SMR NO: 2088
PARISH: STRETHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 536
PARISH: STRETHAM

SMR NO: 6906

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, FEATURES (CROP MARKS)

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 537
PARISH: STRETHAM

SMR NO: 10394A

CATAGORY: COIN. HOARD
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 538
PARISH: STRETHAM

SMR NO: 06928A

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 539
PARISH: STUTNEY

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: DOCK
PERIOD: RB

<u>METHOD OF RECOVERY:</u>	FIELD SURVEY
<u>DISCOVERY:</u>	1980

DATA:
POTTERY, WOODEN STRUCTURES

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 540 SMR NO:
PARISH: SUTTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK. HOARD METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
CHRISTIAN METALWORK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: TOYNBEE 1964, 176 ART IN BRITAIN UNDER

SITE ID: 541 SMR NO: 5636
PARISH: SUTTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 542 SMR NO:
PARISH: SUTTON

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
GOLD RING

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 543 SMR NO:
PARISH: SUTTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: SALZMAN 1938

SITE ID: 544 SMR NO:
PARISH: SWAFFHAM BULBECK

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 545 SMR NO:
PARISH: SWAFFHAM BULBECK

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURE, POTTERY

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 10. 1979
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 546 SMR NO:
PARISH: SWAFFHAM PRIOR

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB AND A/S RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: M.A 1993, 94
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 547 SMR NO:
PARISH: SWAFFHAM PRIOR

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 548 SMR NO: 6427
PARISH: SWAFFHAM PRIOR

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
HUMAN BONES

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 550 SMR NO:
PARISH: SWAVERSEY

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
?

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 551 SMR NO: 1205
PARISH: TADLOW

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1960

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 552 SMR NO:
PARISH: TEVERSHAM

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
LINEARS,STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 553 SMR NO:
PARISH: TEVERSHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURAL

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 554 SMR NO:
PARISH: TEVERSHAM

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
ENCLOSURE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 13. 1982
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 555 SMR NO:
PARISH: THORNEY

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 556 SMR NO:
PARISH: THORNEY

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, LINEARS

SOURCE: PCAS 1991
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 557 SMR NO: 7722
PARISH: THORNEY

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
AXE

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 558 SMR NO: 7721
PARISH: THORNEY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. FRAGMENTARY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
SPEAR, HUMAN BONE, INHUMATION ?

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 559 SMR NO:
PARISH: THORNEY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 560 SMR NO:
PARISH: THORNEY

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 561 SMR NO: 115
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
FURNACES, POTTERY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE; JRS 56; HFAS BULL 12, 1965; CBA GRP 7

SITE ID: 562 SMR NO:
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
STRUCTURES, FURNACES

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 6. 1975
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 563 SMR NO: 1992
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 564 SMR NO: 01992A
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 565 SMR NO: 1990
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN, POTTERY, TESSELATED PAVEMENT, ROOFING TILE, FLUE TILE,

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 566 SMR NO: 00059A
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
BUILDING, VILLA, COINS

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: DUROBRIVAE 1828; JRS 1929, 1949,; BRITANNIA 6.

SITE ID: 567 SMR NO: 1973
PARISH: THORNHAUGH

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
STRUCTURE, BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY, COINS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: JRS, 19, 39; BRITANNIA 6

SITE ID: 568 SMR NO: 2136
PARISH: UPTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
SETTLEMENT, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 569 SMR NO: 1591
PARISH: UPTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, SLAG, FLINT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 570 SMR NO: 7668
PARISH: UPTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
COFFIN, POTTERY, INHUMATION

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: NVRC ANNUAL REPORT 1985

SITE ID: 571 SMR NO:
PARISH: UPWELL

CATAGORY: SA/SE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, BRIQ, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 572 SMR NO:
PARISH: UPWELL

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIALS, FURNACES, SKELETONS, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 573
PARISH: UPWELL

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 574
PARISH: UPWELL

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERNS (3), POTTERY, KILN FRAGS, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 575
PARISH: UPWELL

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 576
PARISH: UPWELL

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALETERN, BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 577 SMR NO:
PARISH: UPWELL

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF CROP MARK
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY, CM

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 578 SMR NO:
PARISH: UPWELL

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERN, POTTERY, BRIQUATAGE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 579 SMR NO:
PARISH: UPWELL

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SALTERN, BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 580 SMR NO:
PARISH: UPWELL

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 581
PARISH: UPWELL

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: SA/SE
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BRIQUATAGE, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 582
PARISH: UPWELL

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 583
PARISH: WANSFORD

SMR NO: 1991

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY, COINS, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 584
PARISH: WANSFORD

SMR NO: 2039

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 585 SMR NO: 5351
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
SWORD

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 586 SMR NO:
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 587 SMR NO:
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
LINEARS AND POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PHILLIPS 1970

SITE ID: 588 SMR NO:
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 589 SMR NO:
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 590 SMR NO:
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 591 SMR NO: 5312
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1920

DATA:
SFB, SMALL FINDS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 592 SMR NO: 9024
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BONE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 593 SMR NO:
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DOMESTIC WASTE, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 594 SMR NO: 11560B
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR/FP
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 595 SMR NO: 9049
PARISH: WATERBEACH

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB AND A/S RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTERY SCATTERS, DOMESTIC WASTE, METALWORK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 596 SMR NO:
PARISH: WENDY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DOMESTIC REFUSE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 5. 1974
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 597
PARISH: WENTWORTH

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: POTTERY
PERIOD: RB

METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 598
PARISH: WENTWORTH

SMR NO:

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
SQUARE HEADED BROOCH

SOURCE: ?
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 599
PARISH: WENTWORTH

SMR NO: 5610

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
SMALL LONG BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 600
PARISH: WERRINGTON

SMR NO: 50143

CATAGORY: METALWORK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY

METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BROOCH

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 601 SMR NO:
PARISH: WERRINGTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
?

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 10. 1979
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 602 SMR NO:
PARISH: WEST WICKHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
METALWORK,URNS

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 603 SMR NO:
PARISH: WEST WICKHAM

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, METALWORK, METALWORKING, COINS

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 604 SMR NO:
PARISH: WESTERN COLVILLE

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 605 SMR NO: 2921
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATION, POTTERY, PIT

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 606 SMR NO:
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
PITS, LINEARS, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 607 SMR NO: 2938
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 608 SMR NO: 2940
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, COINS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 609 SMR NO: 3154
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, COINS, LINEARS, PITS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 610 SMR NO: 1440
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: COIN. SINGLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 611 SMR NO:
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, DARK AREA, BUILDING MATERIAL, COINS

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 612 SMR NO: 10161
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 613 SMR NO:
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 614 SMR NO: 7728
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 615 SMR NO:
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 616 SMR NO: 02834A
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
LINEARS, SFBS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 617 SMR NO:
PARISH: WHITTLESEY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 2
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PCAS 7

SITE ID: 618 SMR NO: 4310
PARISH: WHITTLESFORD

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 619 SMR NO:
PARISH: WICKEN

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POSSIBLE EARLY SAXON SHERD

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 620 SMR NO: 10525
PARISH: WICKEN

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
COINS, CM OF BUILDING

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 621 SMR NO:
PARISH: WICKEN

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY AND METALWORK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 622 SMR NO:
PARISH: WICKEN

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
BUCKLE STRAP

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 623 SMR NO:
PARISH: WICKEN

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTERY, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 624 SMR NO:
PARISH: WICKEN

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
METALWORK

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 625 SMR NO: 5626
PARISH: WILBURTON

CATAGORY: COIN. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
COIN

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 626 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, BUILDING MATERIAL

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 627 SMR NO: 08606A
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, DARK STAIN

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 628 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: ENCLOSURE METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, LINEARS, ENCLOSURES

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 629 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTERS, LINEARS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 630 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
RUMORS

SOURCE: TAYLOR 1998
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 632 SMR NO: 5877
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER. METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1940.

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 633 SMR NO: 3638
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURES, LINEARS, POTTRY

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS: SEE: VCH CAMBS 7, 1978

SITE ID: 634 SMR NO: 5769
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 635 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY, LINEARS, ENCLOSURES, QUERNS, HUT CIRCLES

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 636 SMR NO: 5792
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, DOMESTIC REFUSE

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 637 SMR NO: 5791
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 638 SMR NO: 5767
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY, CROP MARK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 639 SMR NO: 8605
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, CROP MARK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 640 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DARK STAIN

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 641 SMR NO: 5786
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 642 SMR NO: 5883
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1950

DATA:
POTTERY, BUILDING MATERIAL, CROP MARK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 643 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
STRUCTURS, POTTERY, WELL

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 644 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER. METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 645 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY, QUERN FRAGS, ROOF TILE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 646 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER. METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 647 SMR NO: 11781A
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 648 SMR NO: 5754
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 649 SMR NO:
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF CROP MARK
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, LINEARS, PIT ALIGNMENTS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 650 SMR NO: 5742
PARISH: WILLINGHAM

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 651 SMR NO: 06057C
PARISH: WIMBLINGTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POST HOLE BUILDING

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS: FENLAND RESEARCH 1, 1984. SYLVESTER

SITE ID: 652 SMR NO:
PARISH: WIMBLINGTON

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: RB AND A/S RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1970

DATA:
?

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 653 SMR NO:
PARISH: WIMBLINGTON

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 654 SMR NO:
PARISH: WIMPOLE

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
LINEARS, POTTERY, DOMESTIC WASTE

SOURCE: BRITANNIA 21. 1990
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 655 SMR NO: 3402
PARISH: WIMPOLE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, METALWORK

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 656 SMR NO:
PARISH: WIMPOLE

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE: M.A 1991
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 657 SMR NO: 3335
PARISH: WIMPOLE

CATAGORY: POTTERY METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 658 SMR NO:
PARISH: WIMPOLE

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
STRUCTURAL, LINEARS

SOURCE: PCAS 1990
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 659 SMR NO:
PARISH: WISBECH

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
URNS

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: MEANEY

SITE ID: 660 SMR NO: 01926A
PARISH: WISBECH

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
2 EARLY A/S BROOCHES

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS: SEE: PHILLIPS 1939

SITE ID: 661 SMR NO:
PARISH: WISBECH ST MARY

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
DARK AREA, POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 662 SMR NO:
PARISH: WISBECH ST PETER

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
FINDS SCATTERS, FEATURES

SOURCE: PCAS 1986
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 663 SMR NO:
PARISH: WITCHAM

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
POTTERY

SOURCE: FP 10
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 664 SMR NO: 10698
PARISH: WITTERING

CATAGORY: OCCUPATION DEBRIS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, TILE, MORTARIUM

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 665 SMR NO: 50014
PARISH: WITTERING

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
FINGER RING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 666 SMR NO: 28
PARISH: WITTERING

CATAGORY: METALWORK METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: ?

DATA:
FINGER RING

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: BM GUIDE TO THE ANTIQUITIES OF ROMAN

SITE ID: 667 SMR NO:
PARISH: WOOD WALTON

CATAGORY: POTTERY SCATTER METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1980

DATA:
POTTERY SCATTER

SOURCE: FP 6
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 668 SMR NO: 8181
PARISH: WOODSTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
CEMETERY, URN, KNIFE, BROOCH, BUCKET MOUNT

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS: RCHM CAMBS

SITE ID: 669 SMR NO: 50342
PARISH: YARWELL

CATAGORY: BUILDING COMPLEX METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1930

DATA:
STRUCTURE, POTTERY

SOURCE: SMR-P
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 670 SMR NO: 1628
PARISH: YAXLEY

CATAGORY: INDUSTRIAL SITE METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
POTTERY, KILNS

SOURCE: SMR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 671 SMR NO:
PARISH: FULBOURN

CATAGORY: RELIGIOUS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
BUILDING MATERIAL, STRUCTURE, CIONS, INHUMATION

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 672 SMR NO:
PARISH: STAPLEFORD

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF UNKNOWN
PERIOD: A/S RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 673 SMR NO:
PARISH: GULDEN MORDEN

CATAGORY: BURIAL METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATIONS

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 675 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLINGTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, GRAVE GOODS, CREMATIONS

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 675 SMR NO:
PARISH: LITTLINGTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 19C

DATA:
STRUCTURES

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 676 SMR NO:
PARISH: GULDEN MORDEN

CATAGORY: BURIAL METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUACTIONS, CREMATIONS, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 677 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHATTERIS

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 18C

DATA:
INHUMATIONS, URN, GRAVEGOODS

SOURCE: MEANEY
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 678 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHESTERTON

CATAGORY: FRAGMENTARY BURIALS METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
FINDS

SOURCE: MEANEY
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 679 SMR NO:
PARISH: CHIPPENHAM

CATAGORY: BURIAL. MULTIPLE METHOD OF NON ARCHAEOLOGICAL
PERIOD: POSS EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1900

DATA:
INHUMATIONS GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: MEANEY
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 680 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: SETTLEMENT FEATURES METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
DITCHES, SFBS, HUMAN BONES, POTTERY, POST HOLES, STRUCTURES

SOURCE:
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 681 SMR NO:
PARISH: GILDEN MORDEN

CATAGORY: BURIAL METHOD OF EXCAVATION
RECOVERY:

PERIOD:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
INHUMATION

SOURCE:
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 682 SMR NO:
PARISH: FOXTON

CATAGORY: AG/IND BUILDINGS METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
DITCHES, SFBS, HUMAN BONES, POTTERY, POST HOLES, STRUCTURES

SOURCE:
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 683 SMR NO:
PARISH: HINXTON

CATAGORY: BURIAL METHOD OF EXCAVATION
PERIOD: EARLY RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY: 1990

DATA:
INHUMATION, GRAVE GOODS

SOURCE: TAYLOR
FURTHER REFS:

SITE ID: 684 SMR NO:
PARISH: CASTOR

CATAGORY: SMALL TOWN METHOD OF
PERIOD: RB RECOVERY:
DISCOVERY:

DATA:
STRUCTURES, POTTERY, COINS

SOURCE: SCOTT 1993
FURTHER REFS:

Bibliography.

- | | | |
|------------------------------|------|--|
| Arnold, C. J | 1980 | Wealth and Social Structure: A Matter of Life and Death. In Rahtz, P, A, Dickinson, T and Watts, L (eds) <i>Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries 1979</i> . B.A.R Brit Ser. 82. (Oxford: B.A.R.) p.81-142. |
| Arnold, C. J | 1984 | <i>Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England: An Archaeological Study</i> . (London & Sydney: Croom Helm) |
| Badau, E | 1985 | Archaeological Source Criticism and the History of Modern Cultivation in Denmark. In Kristiansen, K (ed) <i>Archaeological Formation Processes. The Representativity of Archaeological Remains from Danish Prehistory</i> . Studies in Scandinavian Prehistory and Early History v. 2. (København: Nationalmuseet) p.63-81 |
| Barrett, J.C | 1994 | <i>Fragments From Antiquity. An Archaeology of Social Life in Britain, 2900-1200BC</i> . (Oxford UK, Cambridge USA: Blackwell) |
| Barton, K | 1962 | Settlements of the Iron Age and Pagan Saxon Periods at Linford, Essex. <i>Trans Essex Arch Soc 3 ser 1:57-102</i> |
| Benson, D & Miles, D | 1974 | <i>The Upper Thames Valley. An Archaeological Survey of the River Gravels</i> . Oxfordshire Archaeology Unit Survey 2. (Oxford: Oxford Archaeology Unit) |
| Beresford, M and Hurst, J, G | 1971 | <i>Deserted Medieval Villages</i> . (London: Lutterworth, P.) |
| Boyle, A, Dodd, A & Miles, D | 1996 | <i>Two Oxfordshire Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: Berinsfield and Didcot</i> . Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 8. (Oxford: Oxford Archaeology Unit) |
| Bourdieu, P | 1977 | <i>Outline of a Theory of Practice</i> . (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) |

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|---|
| Buckley, D. G (ed) | 1980 | <i>Archaeology in Essex to AD 1500</i> . CBA Research Report 34 (Chelmsford: Essex County Council) |
| Carter, G. A | 1998 | <i>Excavations at Orsett 'Cock' Enclosure, Essex</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Report 86. (Chelmsford: Essex County Council) |
| Challends, A | 1974 | A Roman Industrial Site and Villa at Sacrewell, Thornhaugh. <i>Durobrivae</i> 2:13-17 |
| Challands, A | 1975 | The Roman Villa at Helpston. <i>Durobrivae</i> 3:22-23 |
| Condron, F | 1995 | When is a Town Not a Town? 'Small towns' on the Nene and Welland in their Context. In: Brown, A, E (ed). <i>Roman Small Towns in Eastern England and Beyond</i> . Oxbow Monographs 52 (Oxford: Oxbow Books) p.103-118 |
| Collingwood, R. G & Myres, J. N. L | 1937 | <i>Roman Britain and the English Settlements</i> . (Oxford: Clarendon) |
| Crabtree, P. J | 1989 | <i>West Stow: Early Anglo-Saxon Animal Husbandry</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Report 47 (Ipswich: Suffolk County Planning Department) |
| Dannell, G | 1974 | Roman Industry in Normangate Field, Castor. <i>Durobrivae</i> 2:8-9 |
| Dark, K & Dark, P | 1997 | The Landscape of Roman Britain. (Stroud: Sutton) |
| Davis, N | 1998 | Archaeological Investigations in Cambridgeshire: A National Overview. <i>PCAS LXXXVI</i> :93-97 |
| Dawson, M | 1995 | Sandy. In: Brown, A. E (ed) <i>Roman Small Towns in Eastern England and Beyond</i> . Oxbow Monographs 52 (Oxford: Oxbow Books) p.167-177 |

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|---|
| DoE | 1990 | <i>Archaeology and Planning: Planning Policy Guidance 16</i> (London: Department of the Environment) |
| Dixon, P. H | 1993 | The Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Mucking: an interpretation In: Filmer-Shankey, W (ed) <i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 6</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology) p.125-145 |
| Dixon, P. W | 1979 | How Saxon is the Saxon House. In Drury, J (ed) <i>Structural Reconstructions</i> . B.A.R Brit Ser 110 (Oxford: B.A.R.) p.275-88 |
| Dobinson, C & Denison, S | 1995 | <i>Metal Detecting and Archaeology in England</i> . (London: English Heritage & Council for British Archaeology) |
| Evison, V. I | 1987 | <i>Dover: The Buckland Anglo-Saxon Cemetery</i> . English Heritage Archaeological Report 3 (London: RCHME) |
| Evison, V. I | 1988 | <i>An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Alton, Hampshire</i> . Hampshire Field Club Monograph 4 (Southampton: Hampshire Field Club) |
| Evison, V. I & Hill, P | 1996 | <i>Two Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Beckford, Hereford and Worcester</i> . CBA Research report 33. (York: Council for British Archaeology) |
| Esmonde-Cleary, A. S | 1989 | <i>The Ending of Roman Britain</i> . (London: Batsford) |
| Esmonde-Cleary, A. S | 1993 | Approaches to the Differences between Late Romano-British and Early Anglo-Saxon Archaeology. In: Filmer-Shankey, W (ed) <i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 6</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology) p.57-64 |
| Evans, C | 1993 | <i>Archaeological Investigations at Hinxtan Quarry, Cambridgeshire</i> (Rpt 88). Unpublished Assessment Report, Cambridge Archaeology Unit. |
| Finn, N | Forthcoming | An Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Eye Kettleby. Unpublished Excavation Report, |

Leicester University Archaeology Unit.

- | | | |
|-----------------|------|---|
| Foard, G | 1978 | Systematic Fieldwalking and the Investigation of Saxon Settlement in Northamptonshire.
<i>World Archaeology</i> 9.3:357-74 |
| Foster, W, K | 1880 | Account of the Excavation of an Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Barrington, Cambridgeshire <i>C.A.S. Comm V</i> :5-32 |
| Fox, C | 1923 | <i>The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region.</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) |
| Fox, C | 1924 | Excavations at Foxton, Cambridgeshire <i>PCAS XXV</i> :37-49 |
| Fulford, M | 1979 | Pottery Production and Trade at the End of Roman Britain: the Case Against Continuity. In: Casey, P. J (ed) <i>The End of Roman Britain.</i> BAR Brit Ser 71 (Oxford: B.A.R.) p.120-132 |
| Gilchrist. R | 1997 | Ambivalent Bodies: Gender and Medieval Archaeology. In: Moore, J and Scott, E (eds) <i>Invisible people and Processes. Writing Gender into European Archaeology.</i> (London and New York: Leicester University Press) p.42-59 |
| Green, H, J, M. | 1975 | Roman Godmanchester. In Rodwell, W and Rowley, T. (eds). <i>Small Towns of Roman Britain.</i> B.A.R. Brit Ser 15 (Oxford: B. A. R) p.183-210 |
| Going, G | 1997 | Roman. In: Glazebrook, J. (ed). <i>Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties. 1. Resource Assessment.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 3. (Norwich: Scole Archaeological Committee) p.35-43. |
| Gowland, R. L | 2000 | Forgotten Ages |
| Gurney, D | 1997 | A Note on the Distribution of Metal-Detecting in Norfolk. In: <i>Norfolk Archaeology XLII-IV</i> : 528-532 |

- | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---|
| Hall, D | 1978 | Elm. A Field Survey. <i>PCAS</i> 68:21-46 |
| Hall, D | 1987 | <i>The Fenland Project 2. Fenland Landscapes and Settlements between Peterborough and March.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 35. (Cambridge: Cambridgeshire Archaeological Committee) |
| Hall, D | 1992 | <i>The Fenland Project 6: The Southwest Cambridgeshire Fenlands.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 56. (Cambridge: Cambridgeshire Archaeological Committee) |
| Hall, D | 1996 | <i>The Fenland Project 10: The Isle of Wisbech and Ely.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 79 (Gressenhall: Field Archaeology Division, Norfolk Museums Service) |
| Hall, D & Coles, J | 1994 | <i>Fenland Survey. An Essay in Landscape and Persistence.</i> (London: English Heritage) |
| Halsall, G | 1995 | The Merovingian Period in Northwest Gaul: Transition or Change? In: Bintliff, J & Hamerow, H (eds) <i>Europe Between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Recent Archaeological Research in Western and Southern Europe.</i> BAR Int Ser. 617. (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum.) p.38-57 |
| Hamerow, H | 1993a | <i>Excavations at Mucking Volume 2: The Anglo-Saxon Settlement.</i> English Heritage Archaeology Report. No. 21 (London: English Heritage) |
| Hamerow, H | 1993b | An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery near West Hendred, Oxon In: Filmer-Shankey, W (ed) <i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History</i> 6 (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology) p.113-124 |
| Hamerow, H | 1995a | Shaping Settlements: Early Medieval Communities in Northwest Europe. In Bintliff, J & Hamerow, H (eds) <i>Europe Between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Recent Archaeological Research in Western and Southern Europe.</i> BAR Int Ser. 617. (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum) p.8-37 |

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Hamerow, H | 1995b | An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery near west Hendred, Oxon. In: Filmer-Shankey, W (ed) <i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 6</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology) p.113-124 |
| Harke, H | 1991 | "Warrior Graves"? The Background of the Anglo-Saxon Weapon Burial Rite. <i>Past and Present</i> 126:22-43 |
| Hedeager, L | 1992 | <i>Iron Age Societies. From Tribe to State in Northern Europe, 500BC-AD700.</i> (Oxford Blackwell) |
| Higham, N | 1992 | <i>Rome, Britain and the Anglo-Saxons.</i> (London: Seaby) |
| Hills, C | 1977 | <i>The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hill, North Elmham, Part I: Catalogue of Cremations.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 6. (Derehem: Norfolk Archaeology Unit) |
| Hills, C, Penn, K & Rickett R | 1981 | <i>The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hill, North Elmham, Part II: Catalogue of Cremations.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 11. (Derehem: Norfolk Archaeology Unit) |
| Hills, C, Penn, K & Rickett R | 1984 | <i>The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hill, North Elmham, Part III: Catalogue of Cremations.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 21. (Derehem: Norfolk Archaeology Unit) |
| Hills, C, Penn, K & Rickett R | 1987 | <i>The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hill, North Elmham, Part IV: Catalogue of Cremations.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 34. (Derehem: Norfolk Archaeology Unit) |
| Hingley, R | 1991 | The Romano-British Countryside: The Significance of Rural Settlement. In: Jones, R. F. J. (ed) <i>Roman Britain: Recent Trends.</i> (Sheffield: J. R. Collis Publications) p.75-80 |
| Hingley, R | Forthcoming | Officers and Gentlemen: A History of Roman Archaeology |

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|---|
| Howe | 1984 | An Anglo-Saxon Brooch from the Cambridgeshire Fens. <i>PCAS LXXII:10-13</i> |
| Jackson, R & Potter, T. W | 1996 | <i>Excavations at Stonea, Cambridgeshire, 1980-85.</i> (London: British Museum) |
| Jones, M. U | 1980 | Mucking and the Early Saxon Rural settlement in Essex. In Buckley (ed) <i>Archaeology in Essex to AD 1500</i> . CBA Research Report 34 (London: Council for British Archaeology) p.82-86 |
| Jones, R | 1973 | A Romano-British Cemetery and Farmstead at Lynch Farm. <i>Durobrivae 1:13</i> |
| Jones, R | 1974 | A Roman and Saxon Farm at Walton, North Bretton. <i>Durobrivae 2:29-31</i> |
| Jones, W. T | 1980 | Early Saxon Cemeteries in Essex. In Buckley (ed) <i>Archaeology in Essex to AD 1500</i> . CBA Research Report 34. (London: Council for British Archaeology) p.87-96 |
| Kristiansen, K | 1985 | Post-depositional Formation Processes and the Archaeological Record. In: Kristiansen, K (ed) <i>Archaeological formation processes : the representativity of archaeological remains from Danish prehistory</i> . Studies in Scandinavian prehistory and early history v. 2 (København: Nationalmuseet) p.7-11 |
| Lane, T | 1988 | Pre-Roman Origins for Settlement in the Fens of South Lincolnshire. In Hall, D and Chippindale, C (eds) <i>Survey, Environment and Excavation in the English Fenland</i> . <i>Antiquity</i> 62:305-76 |
| Leeds, E. T | 1923 | An Anglo-Saxon Village near Sutton Courtenay. <i>Archaeologia LXXII:147-72</i> |
| Lethbridge, T, C. | 1927 | An Anglo-Saxon Hut on the Carr Dyke at Waterbeach. <i>Antiquaires Journal</i> 7 :141-146 |
| Lethbridge, T, C. & Tebbutt, C. F | 1932 | Huts of the Anglo-Saxon period. <i>Ca AS Comms XXXII:133-152</i> |

- | | | |
|---|------|--|
| Leeds, E. T. & Short,
H de S | 1953 | <i>An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Petersfinger,
Near Salisbury, Wilts.</i> (Salisbury: Salisbury
Museum) |
| Lucy, S. J | 1998 | <i>The Early Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries of East
Yorkshire: An Analysis and Re-Interpretation.</i>
B.A.R Brit Ser 272. (Oxford: Archaeopress) |
| Mackreth, D. F | 1974 | Hall Farm, Orton Longueville <i>Durobrivae</i>
2:24-27 |
| Mackreth, D. F | 1975 | Hall Farm, Orton Longueville <i>Durobrivae</i>
4:24-25 |
| Mackreth, D. F | 1995 | Durobrivae, Chesterton, Cambridgeshire. In:
Brown, A, E (ed) <i>Roman Small Towns in
Eastern England and Beyond.</i> (Oxford:
Oxbow) p.147-156 |
| Mackreth, D. F | 1996 | <i>Orton Hall Farm: A Roman and Early Anglo-
Saxon Farmstead.</i> East Anglian Archaeology
Report No 76. (Manchester: Nene Valley
Archaeological Trust) |
| Malim, T | 1989 | Barrington Anglo-Saxon Cemetery 1989. <i>PCAS</i>
<i>LXXIX</i> :45-62 |
| Malim, T | 1997 | New Evidence on the Cambridgeshire Dykes
and Worsted Street Roman Road. <i>PCAS</i>
<i>LXXXV</i> :27-123 |
| Malim, T & Hines, J | 1998 | <i>The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Edix Hill
(Barrington A), Cambridgeshire.</i> CBA
Research Report 112. (York: Council for
British Archaeology) |
| Maynard, D. J,
Cleary, R, Moore, R
and Brooks, I, P | 1994 | Excavations at Foxton, Cambridgeshire. In:
Price, J, Brookes, I. P & Maynard, D. J (eds)
<i>The Archaeology of the St. Neots to Duxford
Gas Pipeline: 1994.</i> B.A.R. Brit Ser 255.
(Oxford: Tempus Reparatum) p.21-39 |
| Meaney, A | 1964 | <i>A Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites</i>
(London: George Allen and Unwin) |

- | | | |
|---------------------------|------|---|
| Meaney, A & Hawkes, C. S | 1970 | <i>Two Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Winnall, Winchester, Hampshire.</i> Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 4. (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology) |
| Medlycott, M & Germany, M | 1994 | Archaeological Fieldwalking in Essex, 1985-93: interim results. <i>Essex Archaeology and History</i> 25:14-28 |
| Miller, M & Miller, T. E | 1981 | Edmunsoles and Haslingfield. <i>PCAS LXXI</i> :41-72 |
| Millett, M | 1985 | Field Survey calibration: A Contribution. In Haselgrove, C, Millett, M and Smith, I (eds) <i>Archaeology from the Ploughsoil: Studies in the Interpretation of Field Survey Data.</i> (Sheffield: Sheffield University, Department of Archaeology and Prehistory) p.31-38 |
| Millett, M | 1990 | <i>The Romanisation of Britain.</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) |
| Millett, M | 1994 | Treasure: Interpreting Roman Hoards. In Cottam, S, Dungworth, D, Scott, S and Taylor, J (eds) <i>TRAC94: Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference.</i> (Oxford: Oxbow) p.107-118 |
| Mills, N | 1985 | Sample Bias, Regional Analysis and Fieldwalking in British Archaeology. In Haselgrove, C, Millett, M and Smith, I (eds) <i>Archaeology from the Ploughsoil: Studies in the Interpretation of Field Survey Data.</i> (Sheffield: Sheffield University, Department of Archaeology and Prehistory) p.39-50 |
| Milton, B | 1987 | Excavations at Barrington's Farm Orsett Cock, Thurrock, Essex 1983. <i>Essex Archaeology and History</i> 18:16-33 |
| Neville, R. C | 1854 | Anglo-Saxon Cemetery Excavated January 1853. <i>Arch. Journal</i> IX:95-115 |

- | | | |
|--|------|--|
| Newman, J | 1990 | The Late Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement Pattern in the Sandlings of Suffolk. In: Carver, M. O. H (ed) <i>The Age of Sutton Hoo</i> (Woodbridge: Boydell) p.25-38 |
| Pader, E. J. | 1982 | <i>Symbolism, Social Relations and the Interpretation of Mortuary Remains</i> . BAR Int Ser 82. (Oxford: B.A.R) |
| Powlesland, D | 1996 | <i>West Heslerton. The Anglian Settlement. Assessment of Potential and Updated Project Design for Analysis and Publication</i> . Unpublished Project Design |
| Powlesland, D | 1998 | Early Anglo-Saxon Settlements, Structures, Form and Layout. In: Hines, J (ed) <i>The Anglo-Saxons from the migration period to the eighth century: an ethnographic perspective</i> . (Woodbridge: Boydell) p.101-123 |
| Pryor, F. M. M,
French, C, Crowther,
D, Gurney, D &
Taylor, M | 1985 | <i>Fenland Project 1: Archaeology and Environment in the Lower Welland Valley</i> . East Anglian archaeology Report 27. (Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeology Committee) |
| Pullinger , J & Young
C. J | 1981 | Obelisk Kilns, Harston. <i>PCAS LXXI :1-13</i> |
| Radford, C. A. R | 1957 | The Saxon House: a Review and some Parallels. <i>Medieval Archaeology 1</i> :27-38 |
| Rahtz, P | 1976 | Buildings and Rural Settlement. In: Wilson, D. M. (ed). <i>The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p.49-99 |
| RCHM(E) | 1969 | Peterborough New Town. An Archaeological and Architectural Survey. (London: H.M.S.O.) |
| Richards, J. D | 1992 | Anglo-Saxon Symbolism In: Carver, M. O. H (ed) <i>The Age of Sutton Hoo</i> (Woodbridge: Boydell) p.131-148 |
| Roberts, J | 1995 | <i>Hinxton Hall to Great Chesterford (Rpt A81)</i> . Unpublished Assessment Report. Cambridgeshire County Council |

- | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---|
| Scott, E | 1993 | <i>A Gazetteer of Roman Villas in Britain</i>
Leicester Archaeology Monographs 1
(Leicester; Leicester University, Department of
Archaeology) |
| Scull, C. J. | 1992 | Before Sutton Hoo: Structures of Power and
Society in Early East Anglia. In: Carver, M. O.
H (ed) <i>The Age of Sutton Hoo</i> . (Woodbridge:
Boydell) p.3-24 |
| Shaw, M | | The Discovery of Saxon Sites Below Field
Walking Scatters: Settlement Evidence at
Brixworth and Upton, Northants.
<i>Northamptonshire Archaeology</i> 25:77-93 |
| Shennan, S | 1985 | <i>Experiments in the Collection and Analysis of
Archaeological Survey Data: The East
Hampshire Survey</i> . (Sheffield: University of
Sheffield) |
| Taylor, B | Forthcoming | Sample Bias, Site Recovery and
Archaeological Source Criticism:
Understanding the Roman to Saxon Transition
in Southern England. In: Cumberpatch, C and
Blinkhorn, B (eds). Forthcoming |
| Toller, H | 1980 | An Interim Report on the Excavation of Orsett
'Cock' Enclosure, Essex. 1976-79 <i>Britannia</i>
11:35-42 |
| Tomlinson, S | 1974 | Edmund Artis, Antiquary. <i>Durobrivae</i> 2:22 |
| Tipper | Forthcoming | An Intrasite Spatial Analysis of Early Anglo-
Saxon Settlements. Grubenhäuser: Pit Fills and
Pitfalls |
| Tyler, S | 1996 | Early Saxon Essex AD c. 400-700 In: Bedwin,
O (ed) <i>The Archaeology of Essex: The
Proceedings of the Writtle Conference</i> .
(Chelmsford: Essex County Council) p.108-
116 |
| Tyrell, A | Forthcoming | Corpus Saxonum: Early Medieval Burial and
Corporeal Identity. In Tyrell (ed) <i>Social
Identity in Early Medieval Britain</i> |

- | | | |
|--------------|-------|--|
| Vince, A | 1990 | <i>Saxon London. An Archaeological Investigation.</i> (London: Seaby) |
| Wade, K | 1983 | The Early Anglo-Saxon Period. In: Lawson A. J. <i>The Archaeology of Witton, Near North Walsham, Norfolk.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 18. (Gressenhall: Norfolk Archaeology Unit) p.50-69 |
| Wade, K | 1997 | Anglo-Saxon and Medieval (Rural). In: Galzebrook, J, (ed). <i>Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties. 1. Resource Assessment..</i> East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 3. (Norwich: Scole Archaeological Committee) p.47-55 |
| Wait, G. A | 1990 | Archaeological Excavations at Godmanchester (A14/A604 Junction). <i>PCAS LXXX</i> :79-95 |
| Welch, M. G | 1983 | <i>Early Anglo-Saxon Sussex.</i> B.A.R. Brit Ser. 112. (Oxford:B.A.R) |
| Welch, M. G | 1985 | Rural Settlement Patterns in the Early and Middle Anglo-Saxon Periods. <i>Landscape History</i> 7:13-24 |
| Welch, M. G | 1992 | <i>Anglo-Saxon England.</i> (London: Batsford) |
| West, S | 1985 | <i>West Stow The Anglo-Saxon Village Volume 1. Text.</i> East Anglian Archaeology Report 1985. (Ipswich: Suffolk County Planning Department) |
| Wild, J, P | 1973a | The Years Work: 1972
<i>Durobrivae</i> 1:4-6 |
| Wild, J, P | 1973b | Longthorpe, An Essay in Continuity.
<i>Durobrivae</i> 1:7-13 |
| Wild, J, P | 1973c | The Roman Fishpond at Lynch Farm.
<i>Durobrivae</i> 1:20-22 |
| Wilkinson, J | 1868 | <i>Collectanea Antiqua VI</i> :154 |

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|------|---|
| Williams, H | 1999 | Monuments and the Past in Early Anglo-Saxon England. <i>World Archaeology</i> 30:90-108 |
| Williamson, T | 1985 | Sites in the Landscape: Approaches to the Post-Roman Settlement of South Eastern England. <i>Archaeological Review from Cambridge</i> 4:1:51-64 |
| Williamson, T | 1986 | The Development of Settlement in North West Essex: the Results of a Recent Field Survey. <i>Essex Archaeology and History</i> 17:120-133 |
| Willis, S | 1997 | Settlement, Materiality and Landscape in the Iron Age of the East Midlands: Evidence, Interpretation and Wider Resonance. In: Gwilt, A and Haselgrove, C (eds) <i>Reconstructing Iron Age Societies. New Approaches to the British Iron Age</i> . Oxbow Monograph 71. (Oxford: Oxbow Books) p.205-215 |
| Wymer, J. J. & Brown, N. R. | 1995 | <i>Excavations at North Shoebury: Settlement and Economy in South East Essex 1500BC-AD 1500</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Report 75. (Chelmsford: Archaeology Section ECC) |

